DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 249 200 SP 025 283

AUTHOR Edelfelt, Roy A.; Johnson, Margo
TITLE The Experience of Higher Education with Teacher Centers.
INSTITUTION American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.; Glassboro State Coll., N.J. Southern New Jersey Regional Teacher Center.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 84
GRANT G007804056
NOTE 89p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 610, Washington, DC 20036 ($6.00).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; *Cooperative Programs; Federal Government; Government Role; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Interprofessional Relationship; Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; *Teacher Centers

ABSTRACT

Five institutions of higher education having federally-funded teacher centers are examined in this monograph. Observation visits were made to the centers, and personnel from the teacher center, the university, and the public schools were interviewed. The study sought information on the use of the university's resources, interaction among professors and teachers, and the teacher center as an asset to the university. The five case studies approached the basic questions from different angles: (1) "Institutionalizing a University-Based Teacher Center--Chicago Teachers' Center, Northeastern Illinois University"; (2) "Connecting Professors and Teachers--Hernando County Teacher Education Center, University of South Florida"; (3) "Reshaping a Teacher Center after Federal Funding--Madison County Teacher Center, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville"; (4) "Taking a Teacher Center to a School--Pittsburgh Area Center for Teachers, Carnegie-Mellon University"; and (5) Improving High School Teaching"--San Fernando Valley Teacher Center, California State University at Northridge." The final chapter includes a brief description of each center and a summary of data from the five sites. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED249200

The Experience Of Higher Education With Teacher Centers

Roy A. Edelfelt
with assistance from
Margo Johnson

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
E. Pomeroy
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
The Southern New Jersey Regional Teacher Center

SP 025 283

The Experience of Higher Education with Teacher Centers

by

Roy A. Edelfelt

with assistance from

Margo Johnson

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

The Southern New Jersey Regional Teacher Center

1984

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

This material does not necessarily reflect the viewpoints of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). AACTE is printing this document to stimulate discussion, study, and experimentation related to teacher centering and higher education.

The Southern New Jersey Regional Teacher Center
Glassboro State College

This document was made possible in part by Grant No. G007804056 from the Teacher Centers Program of the U.S. Office of Education, now the U.S. Education Department, to Glassboro State College. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent officially the position or the policy of either the Education Department or the Southern New Jersey Regional Teacher Center.

Contents

	Acknowledgments	v
1	A Study of Five Higher Education Teacher Centers: The Background and the Plan	1
2	Institutionalizing a University-Based Teacher Center: Chicago Teachers' Center, Northeastern Illinois University	7
3	Connecting Professors and Teachers: Hernando County Teacher Education Center, University of South Florida	19
4	Reshaping a Teacher Center After Federal Funding: Madison County Teacher Center, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville	33
5	Taking a Teacher Center to a School: Pittsburgh Area Center for Teachers, Carnegie-Mellon University	45
6	Improving High School Teaching: San Fernando Valley Teacher Center, California State University at Northridge	57
7	Conclusions, Observations, and Questions	71

Acknowledgments

There were many people who contributed to the information and views included in this monograph. I am particularly indebted to teachers, administrators, higher education personnel, and others at the sites that I visited. They are identified at the ends of Chapters 2-6. Teacher center directors and staff were all very cooperative and helpful. They gave freely of their time and openly of their opinions and experience. I am beholden to them all, particularly to these:

At the Chicago Teachers' Center, Jerry Olson, the director

At the Hernando County Teacher Education Center, Elaine Beeler, the director

At the Madison County Teacher Center, Ray Althoff, the first director, and Don Baden, his successor

At the Pittsburgh Area Center for Teachers, Bette Hutzler Landish, the first director, Malcolm Woodall, her successor, and Carole Popchock, the program coordinator

At the San Fernando Valley Teacher Center, Luis Hernandez, the project director, and Bernice Medinnis, the teacher center director.

Arnette Rauschel (now Arnette Murray-Sowa) and Kathy Yeates, state education agency program officers for teacher centers in Illinois and California respectively, were generous in the help they gave, particularly during site visits in their state. Finally, Allen Schmieder, formerly Chief of the Teacher Centers Program, U.S. Education Department, contributed support, advice, and encouragement throughout this project.

Roy A. Edelfelt

A Study of Five Higher Education Teacher Centers: The Background and the Plan

In 1976, when Congress was determining the provisions of the teacher center legislation, representatives of higher education (notably the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education) made a strong case that a portion of the grants for teacher centers should be awarded to colleges and universities. They argued that teacher education institutions had a long history in professional development and unique and rich resources for teacher development. They contended that this experience, resource, and expertise should be used in carrying out the federal Teacher Centers Program.

As a result, the legislation provided that up to 10 percent of the teacher center grants should be awarded to colleges and universities. The U.S. Office of Education chose to award the full 10 percent.

Most of the regulations for higher education teacher centers were the same as those for school districts. However, some were different. For one, a college or university had to make an agreement with a local education agency in order to have a teacher center, and the local education agency had to approve policy board selections. For another, the indirect cost for colleges and universities was set at eight percent, whereas the schools districts' overhead was whatever each district had already established with the Office of Education. Third, unlike school district proposals, higher education proposals were not subject to state education agency review. (However, in most states that agency did review them.)

In the Office of Education's proposal-selection process, there was a higher education person on every reader team--a 20-percent representation.

In the colleges and universities, as in the public schools, there was some resistance to teacher centers on the part of administrators. That reluctance grew in part out of the regulation that policy boards should have a majority of teacher members and be responsible for the supervision of the teacher center, including the selection of a director and a staff.

It was assumed that the setting of a higher education teacher center would be different. Even if the teacher center was not located on campus, the social, intellectual, and psychological tone, it was thought, would be influenced by the affiliation with a college or university. Some educators feared that the higher education teacher centers would be dominated by professors. Most expected that the higher education teacher centers would be different from school district centers.

Critics of college and university inservice education and graduate study held out hope that a higher education teacher center would improve

university activities designed for the professional development of teachers. There were claims that higher education could bring something unique to teacher centers, and some educators entertained the possibility that a fresh, more productive mesh of practice and theory could be developed.

In some quarters the motives of higher education people were questioned. Was their interest in higher education teacher centers motivated by the need to put underemployed faculty to work? Were they attracted by the on-campus rewards for receiving a federal grant (e.g., promotion and tenure)?

Some public school teachers were critical of the allocation of teacher center funds to colleges and universities. They feared that the needs of teachers would not be the primary focus; that the traditional, less-than-desirable practices of continuing education would be transplanted to teacher centers; and that the prospects of institutionalizing a teacher center in a college or university were dim.

Among teachers there was the adamant feeling that teacher centers were for teachers--to be governed largely by teachers and to be designed to meet teachers' needs as teachers perceived them. The argument was that higher education people had no experience in professional development so conceived. Consequently there was a strong suspicion among some teachers that colleges and universities could not operate teacher centers that conformed to the intent of the legislation.

The mood of the late 1970s must also be recalled in considering what happened with higher education teacher centers. Teacher organizations claimed credit for the passage of the teacher center legislation. In the periodic swing of the pendulum, they were at their peak, proclaiming wide prerogatives in decision making--so much so, in fact, that in many districts school administrators actively resisted the establishment of teacher centers. A survey published by the American Association of School Administrators revealed that most superintendents actually opposed teacher centers because teachers would be in the majority on policy boards and because a policy board operating alongside a school board in determining inservice education programs would set an undesirable precedent. Among higher education people, reservations about the policy board and its teacher majority were more subtle and perhaps less strong, but there was concern on some campuses that teachers would dominate and that teacher centers would take over the inservice education market.

Some higher education people embraced the open-education concept and saw teacher centers as a way to bring more attention to that persuasion. Among them were Vito Perrone, the dean of education at the University of North Dakota, and Lillian Weber, the director of the Workshop Center for Open Education and Advisory Service to Open Corridors. They were teacher center leaders and advocates well before there were federally funded teacher centers. Along with people like David Hawkins, a professor at

the University of Colorado at Boulder, and Kathleen Devaney, the director of the Far West Laboratory's Teachers' Centers Exchange, they believed that teacher centers could serve as a vehicle for creating and nurturing open education in schools.

The higher education people among these open-education advocates hoped that federal funding would bring support to a teacher center on their campus. Surprisingly, almost none of them who wrote proposals were successful in securing funding, despite their knowledge about and commitment to teacher centers. In a way that outcome was a double irony. These people had been pioneers in teacher centering in the United States, and most of them were already operating higher education teacher centers. But the competitive-funding route to support was not their cup of tea; most of them were not practiced grants people.

The situation was different with Devaney. She headed a well-funded National Institute of Education-supported enterprise that promoted networking among teacher center people. The Teachers' Centers Exchange succeeded in developing, spreading, and nurturing the teacher center idea.

Prior to the first competition for federal funding, all of these open-education advocates were waiting in the wings, so to speak. They were ready and willing to partake of the federal largess, but they also saw a role for themselves in spreading their knowledge to new teacher centers, in public schools as well as in colleges and universities. Despite their bitter disappointment when almost none of their proposals were funded in the first round of grants, they opened their doors and offered their experience and understanding to the newcomers, many of whom were neophytes.

Over the four years that the federal government funded teacher centers, there were 10 awards made to institutions of higher education.[1] Five were selected for study in this monograph. The selection was made on the recommendation of state education agency personnel and others knowledgeable about teacher centers. The major criterion was that a reputedly exemplary practice was under way in them. Also, in spring 1982, the five centers seemed destined to survive. The reason for seeking out higher education teacher centers with exemplary practices was to document such achievements before the experience of federally funded centers was too distant a memory. Also, a comprehensive study of all the higher education teacher centers was not possible with the funds available.

---

[1] California State University at Northridge, Carnegie-Mellon University, Glassboro State College, Goddard College, Hofstra University, Northeastern Illinois University, Purdue University, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, the University of New Mexico, and the University of South Florida.

Each of the five teacher centers was visited for a day and half to two days. Personnel from the teacher center, the university, and the public schools were interviewed. All interviews were taped. The facilities, the resources, the setting, and some of the activities were observed. Materials produced by the teacher centers, including proposals prepared for the federal competition, were read. There were in all cases follow-up telephone inquiries. A first draft of the chapter on each teacher center was submitted to several people at each site for criticism; they were asked to give particular attention to the accuracy and the fairness of the piece. The drafts were then revised. Finally, there were interviews to verify features and facts and to raise additional questions, which are discussed in Chapter 7.

In addition to gathering information about exemplary practices, I collected other data on each center:

- Where it was located
- Where its director and its staff came from (a college or university, or a school district)
- How much university faculty were involved in its activities
- Whether it brought professors into schools
- How and by whom its activities were led
- What its nature was (an office or an actual resource/work center)
- What types of activities it provided
- Where its activities took place
- Whether it provided advisory service
- What kinds of teachers it served, in terms of grade and school level
- Whether it served preservice teachers
- What kinds of credit teachers could earn
- Whether it engaged in school improvement
- What role teacher organizations played in it
- Whether its activities were documented
- What its sources of financial support were

- Whether it encouraged or conducted research
- Whether it evaluated its activities
- Whether its sponsoring institution recognized that it had added something to the institution
- From whom it got help during its development.

I also inquired whether higher education teacher centers were different from public school or independent teacher centers.

In compiling the long list of items above, I wanted to know whether the resources of the university had gotten any special use with school people, whether professors and teachers had interacted in profitable ways, and whether a teacher center had proved to be an asset to a university. All of the federally funded teacher centers had some higher education input, but it was mainly through membership on a policy board. Many teacher centers initiated relationships with colleges and universities, but it was thought that neither such contacts nor policy board membership could provide the access possible when the teacher center was an institution's project.

I did not collect much quantitative data. Mertens and Yarger (1981) made an extensive study of such particulars. Two higher education centers were included in that study.

The final chapter of this monograph includes a brief description of each center and a summary of data from the five sites. This is not enough information to warrant definitive conclusions about what higher education teacher centers are or can be, and I do not claim to render such a judgment. I do draw some tentative conclusions in an attempt to answer the various questions and speak to the various concerns that I earlier reported people having about higher education teacher centers. I also make some observations about the five higher education teacher centers in the study and point to some very positive outcomes. Finally, I raise a basic question.

Reference

Mertens, S. K., & Yarger, S. J. (1981). Teacher centers in action: A comprehensive study of program activities, staff services, resources and policy board operations in 37 federally-funded teacher centers. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse Area Teacher Center.

Institutionalizing a University-Based Teacher Center: Chicago Teachers' Center, Northeastern Illinois University

Ever since federal funding for teacher centers began in 1978, enthusiasts have pondered the question of making a teacher center a part of the regular scene, of institutionalizing it into the local setting. For the most part the effort has been to incorporate a teacher center into a school district. When a teacher center has had a college or a university as its fiscal agent, the approach has been to make the teacher center an adjunct operation. At Northeastern Illinois University in Chicago, institutionalizing was a revolutionary move: It involved making the Chicago Teachers' Center (CTC) an academic unit in the college of education, with the director comparable to the chairperson of a department.

Perhaps more amazing, the CTC became an academic unit through the university's regular procedures for granting that status, not by the decree of the provost or the president.

The action also involved securing the endorsements of the Chicago Board of Education and the Chicago Teachers' Union and obtaining a favorable recommendation from the Illinois Board of Governors to the Illinois Board of Higher Education, which made the final decision.

Of course, so formal an institutionalization did not just happen. Arnette Rauschel, the Illinois State Board of Education program officer for teacher centers, recalled that in 1978 when the CTC was first funded, she and Director Jerry Olson

> decided it would be beneficial to begin thinking about what was going to happen after three years [the term of funding] . . . Jerry recognized this was something he'd have to start on immediately and that the effort to institutionalize would take a great portion of his time.

Institutionalization is a complex process that has drawn the attention of many sociologists and educational researchers. In the case of the CTC and Northeastern Illinois University much of the impetus for institutionalization came from the strong grass-roots program that the CTC staff built, reaching out into the school communities they served, drawing university personnel with them. It also developed because university personnel saw a purpose and a use for the teacher center. They came to understand in a number of different ways how the university could benefit from having a teacher center. When school teachers and administrators also found the teacher center an asset, the stage was set to find a way to perpetuate the CTC. How and why it happened is the story we tell here, in both its programmatic and political dimensions.

As a university-based teacher center, the CTC had an unusual origin in the Educational Foundations Department. Olson, an associate professor in that department, had heard about the federal Teacher Centers Program and

wanted to submit a proposal. Mitchell Vogel, another foundations professor, who had been involved with the Open School movement (often related to teacher centers), was supportive. They initiated discussions with colleagues in the college, with teachers through the Chicago Teachers' Union, and with school district officialdom through the Chicago Board of Education. Inez Wilson, CTC associate director and coordinator, recalled, "We had a meeting. Some weren't sure what a teacher center was. The staff development that had occurred to that point was largely through Board of Education-mandated programs. There were few teacher-initiated or teacher-developed programs. The northwest side of the city had nothing like a teacher center. There was a real need for such a thing."

And there was enthusiasm for the idea, particularly among teachers and a number of professors. "At first the administration of the Chicago school system was not terribly excited," Wilson noted. "There was concern about the governance structure, because there would be a majority of teachers on the policy board. They didn't like that." Olson added,

> Since then they've come to realize that their fears were falsely based. There have been very few instances where there has been real disagreement on our policy board, and where there has been, it's not been a lineup of teachers against administrators . . . . The disagreements have been along ideological lines, on how people think about instruction.

Whatever the initial reservations, planning proceeded, people came up with ideas and played with them, and Olson wrote them down. Some were accepted and some rejected. Olson wrote a proposal and it was funded by the federal government.

The CTC took up residence in a huge space with adjacent classrooms on the fourth floor of a private Catholic high school, next to the kitchen of the convent affiliated with the school. Teacher center enthusiasts from the schools and the university took great pride in their new quarters, designing and decorating the center amidst the appetizing aromas of fresh bread and other baked goods. "We did all the painting in this area," said Olson. "Some people from the university art department helped us design it. We put together a place that's colorful and inviting. We accomplished a lot in a very short time. Materials were donated by teachers, by staff, by Alvernia [the host school], and by other educational groups."

The program of the CTC evolved from discussions at policy board meetings, from staff deliberations, through needs assessments in the field, through talking with teachers, and from what seemed to work. As with many teacher centers, the program started with one-shot workshops--two-hour sessions after school or on Saturdays, usually on a single topic. There was also an outreach program. "We said [in the proposal] that we'd work with a number of schools--go into those schools and work with staff and do staff development kinds of things," explained Olson.

Initially, Olson continued, the staff were under some pressure to do all that the proposal had envisioned--offer workshops and seminars, work out in the schools, collect resources for teachers, and consult with teachers on curriculum and instructional problems. Soon, however, they realized that their goals were spread too broadly, that there were not enough staff to accomplish all the goals.

One effort to sharpen the CTC's focus and narrow its goals was undertaken with a grant from the Far West Laboratory's Teachers' Centers Exchange. From the outset the CTC had had a "drop-in" program serving teachers who stopped by unscheduled. The grant supported a study of how the staff worked with these teachers. In examining this part of the program, Wilson explained,

> We asked, "What do we want to happen--more than what is happening? . . . What are we all about?" We talked about how we work with teachers in a certain way. If we are looking for teacher growth, what is it we have to do as staff people? How do we talk with teachers? How do we keep teachers coming back and consulting with us? Do we go out into schools and look at classrooms--that is, do we move into an advisory role?

Out of the study grew the concept of active staffing, a way of working with teachers to foster professional growth. "Active staffing involves concentrating on ways of thinking about teaching rather than on the mere acquisition of new skills and materials . . . [Its] aim is to have teachers examine their assumptions and techniques."[1] If, for example, a teacher comes in for help with a bulletin board and is shown only ideas that relate to bulletin boards, usually he or she chooses something and leaves. In active staffing teacher center staff try to find out why the teacher needs a bulletin board. Wilson described such an incident:

> One teacher starting her first job knew she was going to have behavior-disordered children, and she wanted a bulletin board to make the room look nice. Her basic concern, however, was getting along with those kids, establishing a relationship, some rapport. In working together we decided that the bulletin board could be used to achieve that goal--that she would start a bulletin board but all of those youngsters would help and the bulletin board would be about them.

I asked if the university faculty viewed such a study as scholarly and research oriented and whether university professors had contributed anything to it.

"From the beginning we saw the center as an operation that teamed

---

[1]Margaret Ann Richek & Inez H. Wilson, A Study of the Active Staffing Process of a Teachers' Center (Chicago: Northeastern Illinois University, Chicago Teachers' Center, 1982), p. 11.

university people with teachers," Olson answered. Wilson added that in the active-staffing project Margaret Richek from the college of education's Reading Department had worked with CTC staff. It was, Wilson observed, "a cooperative project with a university person who had research skills . . . --an illustration of combining the talents of a university person with a teacher center person."

University people were also being very helpful to CTC staff in suggesting research and literature that might provide data or ideas relevant to the problems staff were facing. On alternate weeks CTC staff meetings had become devoted to the discussion of literature and relevant research--important inservice education for the staff. "We look at literature critically as we discuss it," Wilson explained. "We don't just accept everything; we analyze data, critique ideas, and examine how they are applicable to our program and the kinds of things we're doing."

"University people see us as a very creative group," Olson continued, "one that comes up with many different kinds of ideas and a lot of new relationships."

Collaboration between the CTC and the university benefitted local teachers directly as well as indirectly. At the time of my visit, for example, university professor Theresa Booker had developed some materials based on Reuven Feuerstein's work on cognition, and she and CTC Outreach Coordinator Christine Wedam were planning a summer program for elementary and secondary school teachers and students. They intended to introduce the teachers to the Feuerstein approach through a combination of theory and practice. The Feuerstein approach assumes that a child who fails to learn is not innately unintelligent but rather is deficient in certain cognitive skills that can be taught to him or her once they are identified. The Feuerstein curriculum includes a Learning Potential Assessment Device and 16 instruments, each of which focuses on a particular cognitive deficiency, such as lack of organizational skills. The Learning Potential Assessment Device uses a test-teach-test method, rather than simply testing as standard intelligence tests do. The method helps teachers get at what the child cannot do at the start and how readily the child responds to instruction. The 16 instruments also use the test-teach-test method. When I visited, Wedam herself was being trained in the approach. She was not passive; she criticized, commented, and shared her perspective as orientation proceeded.

Another illustration of CTC-university collaboration that helped build momentum for institutionalization was professor Nancy Green's appointment to the CTC staff and her work in bringing innovations to teachers. On one occasion, for example, Green went east to Johns Hopkins University to study a program called Teams, Games, and Tournaments, also known as Student Team Learning. In this program students cooperate in mixed-ability teams, using peer tutoring to prepare for exciting group competition. On her return to Chicago, Green shared what she had learned with the entire CTC staff and helped conduct sessions on the program for

local teachers.

University-school linking was also evident in the CTC's outreach program. One of the first outreach activities of the CTC, which got under way in 1981-82, focused on one public school (out of five possibilities) selected by the CTC staff. A proviso of the school's participation was the approval of at least 80 percent of the teachers. The goal was intensive school-based inservice education. "We felt we should be out there knowing what's going on and interacting with teachers on a day-to-day basis--testing out our theories," Wilson explained. Lenore Bedar, a resource teacher on loan from the Chicago Public Schools for a year, said,

> Everyone here [at the center] . . . wants to work with the schools, work closely with the teachers, in public and private schools. And when we're doing this work, . . . we want to go in and work <u>with</u> the teachers. We will <u>not</u> go in and take them a packaged program. We want to go in and say to the staff, including the administration, "Tell us what you want and that is the direction we'll take."

The first year with the one school was a trial run, a chance to learn. At first, CTC staff were perceived as outsiders who were providing a service to teachers. It took awhile, Olson admitted, before "teachers realized we were there not just to provide service but to help develop an inservice project that belonged to the teachers and their school. I think the teachers developed more a sense of ownership . . . , [a sense] that this was their project." For example, 10 faculty members took responsibility for operating and managing the resource room at the school. The principal changed; for example, he came to see reading in a more open-ended way.

Janet Lerner, a special education professor, said, Before the teacher center,

> we had many requests for <u>different</u> things that we could do for schools, but we really never had a vehicle for doing them. Now [with the teacher center] I've got a way to communicate with these people, to say, "We've got a vehicle for meeting your needs" . . . . Sometimes the teachers don't know what they want--but they know there's a need in their school. They want to know about something, and they want to organize it.

Across the many illustrations of CTC activities and style that I saw and heard, there appeared to be a common philosophical orientation. Questioned about this, Olson admitted, "We take a human-development view, both toward learning for children and learning for adults, and that includes us--the staff . . . People learn best how to do things when they have to do it themselves. You need to go through that process."

I asked whether the philosophical position resulted from the persuasions of education professors finding expression in the teacher center or from the teacher center philosophy influencing university people. Olson handled that query skillfully by responding, "It's like-minded people coming together." Finding common purpose and developing philosophical consensus among school and university personnel helped lay the groundwork for institutionalization, just as cooperation on research and program did.

University faculty who were involved with the CTC seemed to agree on these points: The university should come up with some new kinds of service (for a university), traditional graduate schools often did not see that as their role, somebody at Northeastern had to take the responsibility if it was going to get done, and the CTC was one place to create and offer new programs.

Two new kinds of service were illustrated in Olson's explanation of the CTC's developing program. At first, he said, the CTC had put emphasis on one-to-one interactions between teachers and staff--active staffing--and that was continuing.

> But the shift I've sensed this year . . . [influenced by] the desire of the staff and the need [in the field] . . . and in the present economic and research atmospheres . . . is to try to expand that philosophy--to go out and develop staffs, to go out and work with teachers not just one-to-one, but (a) with committees of teachers who represent schools, and (b) with committees of teachers and administrators who represent districts.

Wedam contended that there was something unique in CTC staff and university faculty being able to hear what education was all about from people who were teaching in classrooms:

> They know something that even they sometimes don't respect enough . . . . They have insights and perspectives that center staff and university faculty don't have . . . . It is important to link what is happening in the university with someone who is actually working in the field.

On the other hand, university resources provided through the CTC were important to teachers and school administrators. Often requests for assistance were not just in the area of curriculum. Whether the request was for research on a particular topic or for consultation on such problems as desegregation, the CTC provided the link. Many times teachers do not know where to go for resources, nor how to approach those who have them. Because of the relationships Olson had built with subject-matter specialists in almost all fields at the university, responses to requests for help were fast and fruitful.

Inquiring why a college of education would make a teacher center an

academic unit led to more than programmatic explanations. Teachers, school administrators, CTC staff, and university professors argued first that the program worked--that putting together schools and the university through the CTC was mutually beneficial, particularly for a university with a strong commitment to teacher education. For university administrators there were additional--or multiple--reasons. Which ones were dominant would probably only be known as they were tested over time.

Ahmed A. Fareed, the dean of the college of education, indicated,

> There is nothing wrong in having a specific unit that uses our professors in providing inservice education for teachers in schools . . . That is one of our goals . . . The teacher center has opened up new avenues of faculty development in schools. Not only that, it has helped our faculty to retool, renovate, refresh, and become more involved in practical situations.

The dean went on to explain that the university had an urban mission to fulfill the needs of people living in the area: "People must have a university that will help them solve problems," he said. He applauded innovations initiated on an experimental basis that proved to be successful and beneficial. The CTC was such an innovation, he noted, and he had done everything possible to make it a formal and regular part of the college's structure. In mellifluous tones Fareed characterized the CTC as the "star of our galaxy"--words that would perhaps sound a little melodramatic in standard English but were sincerely authentic in the dean's Middle Eastern accent. Fareed had apparently kept close track of CTC activities and achievements. He had witnessed the enthusiasm of elementary and secondary teachers at the CTC, experienced personal contact with users who had implored him to continue the center, and heard testimonials from teachers, principals, and parents. "When I visited the center," he said, "I found it buzzing like a beehive . . . , everybody busy and happy and working. It's a no-nonsense place." With all this and with the college faculty's enthusiasm for teaching their methods courses at the CTC and having prospective teachers use it, he found the CTC "the kind of thing we want."

"Is incorporating the teacher center into the structure also a survival technique for the college of education?" I asked the dean.

"I don't think so," Fareed replied.

"You can keep all your faculty employed?" I countered.

"Absolutely," he came back. "We won't have a problem for a long time to come. As a matter of fact, we may be short of faculty in a few years. The master's degree programs are doing well. We have enough students to keep our faculty fully employed."

It was obvious that the CTC had contributed to the healthy position in which the college found itself. The CTC had become an attraction for both graduate and undergraduate students.

"Will it be voluntary for university faculty to be involved with the teacher center?" I asked.

"It should be voluntary. If I force anyone to do anything, it isn't going to be successful," said Fareed.

"What percentage of your faculty will eventually be involved in schools through the teacher center?" I asked.

"At least 10 percent, probably more," responded Fareed.

How was the CTC's form and style fitting in with the traditions and the procedures of higher education? Some new procedures were being put to good advantage. For example, the university had recently created a credit-unit concept to justify faculty time on noncredit activities, and the CTC was using this unit to translate university professors' time on CTC programs into traditional academic terms. Some credit work was evident in the CTC's long-term plan, the dean admitted, but, he said, "I don't believe that the majority of the work in our teacher center will be for credit."

However, there were going to be charges for activities that had been free before. Part of the reason for these charges was to satisfy the Illinois State Board of Education, which had contended that participants should pay a little for all the service. "If you offer everything for free, it's not very convincing to funding agencies," Olson observed. "If participants believe in our program enough, they will be willing to shell out some money."

What about the impact of the CTC on the college of education? The CTC was obviously crossing department lines and promoting communications among several departments in order to dovetail various activities into its program. The center thus was serving as a facilitator and a disseminator. It was too soon to assess the influence of those roles. Clearly Olson and his staff had become the university's basic planners for modifying and strengthening the concept of inservice education programs at the university--and that might eventually have impact on the nature and the quality of instruction in the college of education. Olson's job was a tough assignment and was recognized as such by Fareed. Olson "has a heavy load on his shoulders," said Fareed.

> He is the troubleshooter, moving into the different school districts to let them know what we are up to, what is available, what we might help them with. The experimental-developmental approach that Jerry endorses is what has to permeate change in both the college faculty and in school faculties.

Ken Stetson, the university's assistant provost, reiterated Fareed's commitment to institutionalizing the CTC. He knew enough about the CTC's development to explain the top administration's reasons:

> We have made some changes [in the teacher center] from the first year to the third. We think the changes have real merit--so much so that we have institutionalized the program . . . . Jerry's activities for the last three years have been very valuable, and we are willing to subsidize his activity continually through the university's money.

"Is there more to it than the program quality?" I asked. "Is institutionalizing the center desirable politically as well as substantively?"

Stetson nodded, "Yes. We have an image problem. We need to have people know we're here. The teacher center enables us to deal with people we haven't dealt with before."

University administration and faculty were candid about the matter of image and pride. Said Olson,

> We want to believe that we're doing well. Sometimes people get an inferiority complex because they're not the University of Chicago. But every place has a function to fill. There are a lot of legitimate functions and needs in this city that this university can contribute to that the University of Chicago doesn't touch, and some of those are what we're doing at the teacher center.

Discussion came back to the congruity between the style and the function of a teacher center and those of a university. The learning from the field, the linkage with schools, the preoccupation with practical problems--did all these have status in a university community? Also, the center as a headquarters for program development, as a place to churn up new ideas and come up with new programs, perspectives, proposals, and relationships--did this practical aspect of the CTC, the selling, fit the role of the university? Olson defended the CTC and its approach: "We do all those things, but, on the other hand, we're one of the more scholarly groups on campus . . . . Our staff and policy board discuss educational issues and research as much if not more than many other groups on campus."

Wilson chimed in,

> It [our approach] also has something to do with Northeastern's reputation as a teacher training institution [it was formerly Chicago Teachers College]. Teacher education was once its primary function, . . . and the teacher center is an opportunity for the university to say it still has direct contact with schools and principals and what's happening in the field.

Clearly, in the guise of the CTC, a different balance was being struck between the traditional academic stance of the university and a more practical community service. With that balance there seemed also to be a freshness and a candor in purpose, perhaps a recognition of a special role, exemplified in the CTC's being a part of the university. "There are people here who do some good writing and some who publish books," Olson said, "but most people work out in the world in some way and are involved in some kind of public service, and the teacher center is one kind of public service that is significant."

Although the university had made some accommodations to the CTC in other areas, it had made only a few on the issues of academic rank and tenure. Only Olson among the CTC staff had academic rank. All others were considered instructional support people in an administrative capacity, as opposed to a teaching capacity. Stetson explained, "If your primary responsibility is to teach, then you have rank; if it's anything else, then you have an administrative-and-professional appointment." The teacher center staff fit neither of these definitions but were classified as the latter.

One important accommodation in university policy occurred when Olson came up for promotion. Olson applied directly to the dean for it, who sought input from the foundations faculty in making a decision and then made his recommendation (for promotion) to the assistant provost. Olson's teacher center work got translated into terms that his dean and university colleagues recognized as having merit.

University faculty apparently were finding satisfaction in their CTC work but recognized that the typical university categories of teaching, research, and service were not clearly related to their contributions to the CTC. Faculty also admitted that CTC service was more time-consuming than college teaching. Tom Schevers, a professor of special education, remarked, "The rewards aren't the greatest deal . . . , and it's probably easier to teach a course. You have to be someone who wants to do something."

The problems and the difficulties at the CTC were far outweighed by the positive achievements, the enthusiasm for movement and for developing ideas in education, and the challenge of new frontiers to conquer. That university style and form did not always seem to fit was probably inevitable. The real question was whether the CTC and the university could make the necessary accommodations to each other. In the answer to that question probably rested the survival of the CTC as part of the university. Talking about the reasons for institutionalizing the center--substance, public relations, service, or usage--Olson nailed an essential idea. He said,

> You're looking for the critical factor, what was it that did it. My feeling is that everyone has supported us, but the support is for different reasons. Everyone has a different kind of

thing they see that is in their interest. Some people are interested in credit-hour production; others are not so interested in that. Some are concerned with public image. Some believe you've got to have a place--a place with people and furniture and materials and activities . . . . We're all convinced you don't play one option; you play all the options. There's something in this for everyone.

Northeastern Illinois University began in 1867 as Cook County Normal School, Illinois's first institution for teacher education. The city of Chicago took ownership of it in 1938, at which time its name was changed to Chicago Teachers College. In 1965 the college became a state institution again and began to offer programs in the arts and sciences as well as in teacher education. This diversification led to the college's acquiring university status in 1971 and changing its name to Northeastern Illinois University.

The university launched the Chicago Teachers' Center in 1978 with a three-year federal grant--one of only six awarded to institutions of higher education that year. In 1981 the university was among a small number of 1978 grantees that received a second three-year grant.

The Chicago Teachers' Center serves about 7,200 elementary and secondary school teachers in over 200 public and private schools located on the northwest side of Chicago. The center site is about four miles south of the university's main campus, in space the university leases from the Archdiocese of Chicago.

This chapter is based on a site visit to Chicago on June 14-15, 1982. Persons who were interviewed and provided assistance in gathering data were Lenore Bedar, resource teacher, Chicago Teachers' Center, on leave from Chicago Public Schools; Theresa Booker, a professor of reading, Northeastern Illinois University; Robert Bunnell, director of research and development, Northeastern Illinois University; Ahmed A. Fareed, dean of the college of education, Northeastern Illinois University; Tom Feeley, director of research, Chicago Teachers' Union; Nancy Green, a professor of educational foundations, Northeastern Illinois University; Margaret Haas, coordinator of curriculum, Archdiocese of Chicago School Board; Ed Kelly, special education teacher, Hitch Elementary School, Chicago Public Schools; Janet Lerner, a professor of special education and chairperson of the department, Northeastern Illinois University; Jerry Olson, director, Chicago Teachers' Center; Maryjo Pelley, second grade teacher, St. Tarcissus Elementary School, and policy board member, Chicago Teachers' Center; Arnette Rauschel, educational consultant, Illinois State Board of Education; Thomas Schevers, a professor of special education, Northeastern Illinois University; Ken Stetson, assistant provost, Northeastern Illinois University; Christine Wedam, outreach coordinator and resource teacher in June 1982, now coordinator, Chicago Teachers' Center; and Inez Wilson, associate director and coordinator in June 1982, now departed, Chicago Teachers' Center.

Connecting Professors and Teachers: Hernando County Teacher Education Center, University of South Florida

We were only a half hour into our interviewing when "the contract problem" was brought up as an important variable in the story we were about to hear from educators in Hernando County, Florida. This was spring 1982 and Hernando County teachers had been working since fall 1981 without a contract.

"It's been a devastating kind of year," said Betty Lichtenberg, a University of South Florida (USF) professor working part-time in the Hernando County Schools.

Phil Pfost, director of teacher-education-center activities at USF, elaborated, "When the relationships in a school system break down to where the board and the teachers can't even get a contract, you've lost everything, for at least the short term. This is a small enough county that you can have a big impact positively or negatively in a very short time."

"So you think that as we talk to teachers today, we're going to get a lot of sour grapes?" we asked.

"I just don't think that what teachers will have to say will be as positive as it would have been if you'd come a year ago," responded Elaine Beeler, director of the Hernando County Teacher Education Center.

Maybe what teachers and other educators had to say that day was not as positive as it would have been a year earlier, but if we had not been alerted to the possibility, it would not have been obvious. The story we heard was about 90-percent upbeat, 10-percent critical--close to what we heard at other centers.

It was the story of the Hernando County Teacher Education Center's "clinical professors"--USF faculty members who worked part-time in the county's 11 schools, making themselves available to teachers on a confidential basis as consultants on a variety of instructional and professional problems.

For example, back in 1978, sixth grade teacher Maureen Richie had been feeling the pressure: She had been one of four teachers in a "pod"--a large space separated by dividers, intended to accommodate 120 students in configurations that changed regularly in the course of the day. The sixth graders that year were a particularly volatile bunch, said Richie. Even if you handpicked your class, "there was no way you could wind up with a class where one kid wasn't violently offended by another kid's presence." What's more, she went on, "I was pregnant, and I had 33 kids in my

---

Margo Johnson coauthored this chapter.

homeroom, and . . . I felt so crowded." She had remarked to Stuart Silverman, one of two clinical professors working in her school, "Some days I don't have enough corners to put them in, to spread them out!"

"Why don't we build a loft?" he had said.

The loft was still standing the day we visited Richie's classroom at Mitchel Black Elementary School. It bore loving signs of use. "I don't have the heart to paint it," Richie confessed, "because there are names that have been there for four years. I let them write on it as our graffiti board instead of the desks and the walls or whatever."

Richie had used the loft in several different ways over the years, but always as a reward. The first year, students who finished their work early had gone up to the loft on a first-come, first-served basis. That spring all the students had loft time scheduled but were required to earn it by accomplishing particular tasks. Silverman had helped Richie set up the reward systems.

Had the loft worked for her the first year? we wondered.

"Especially that first year," she answered, "because they were such a rough bunch." The loft idea had been new to Hernando County, so the loft had become a curiosity in the system and the community, and for a while the students had had to endure being watched as they used it. But, said Richie,

> it got to the point where nothing really fazed them, and they were really trying to concentrate on getting their work done so they could get in the loft. I don't know what their motivation was . . . All I know was the end result was what I wanted. I wanted a better-behaved class that was getting more of their academic work done and done correctly, and [I wanted] some learning to take place.

The loft was visible evidence of a successful episode in a continuing teacher-clinical professor relationship. Before Silverman got the opening to suggest the loft to Richie, he and fellow clinical professor Charles Manker had been at Mitchel Black Elementary School one or two days a week for a couple of months developing rapport with Richie and other teachers and establishing their credibility. After the loft was built, Silverman continued to support and encourage Richie, regularly dropping in on her in class, at lunch, or in the cafeteria, listening to her problems, and offering suggestions or responding to her own ideas for solving those problems.

Now, in the fourth year of the clinical-professor program, Silverman and Manker were not spending as much time at Mitchel Black as before. But when they were there, they made a point of stopping by the classrooms of teachers with whom they had worked. Karen Olivares, a pod-mate of Richie's

whom Silverman had also assisted, said she liked that kind of follow-up "people contact":

> The professors that know me, know now when they come in that I may need to just hear something good. And they will find something good and give me the shot I need to keep going. You don't have that contact from the administration or ofttimes from your colleagues. And because the professors that you know have spent some time not only developing you as a teacher but developing you as a person, they can pick up on little things like that [knowing you need a boost].

Out at Springstead High School, Dave Naumann, the band director, was getting a different type of assistance from clinical professor John Follman. He had been consulting with Follman weekly for about three years. Said Naumann,

> John's been most effective with me when it comes to my relationships with guidance, administration, and all these people that I don't always understand . . . [For example,] I've had several discussions [with him] about my budget . . . I guess I have a quick temper or something. Instead of me blowing off the handle, John will come in, and I'll say, "Here's my problem. What can I do?" And he'll say, "First, you know what you have to have, and you have to convince them of the need and go in calm and cool like a professional. Don't go in and say, 'Why did you cut my budget?' Say, 'I understand your situation. Here's what we need and if we don't do this, we're going to have to cut back on part of the program.'"

Other problems on which Follman had given Naumann advice were Naumann's disagreements with his principal over evaluations of his performance, and negotiations with local businesses on such matters as work-study programs.

The clinical professors were not just consultants; they were demonstrators too. And their ability to demonstrate, with students, in classrooms, was critical in establishing their credibility. Olivares was clear about that: "They're not ivory-tower professors . . . . They have to deal with the real world, because if you've got professors telling you about classroom management and they've never been in a pod, forget it!" Clinical professor Lichtenberg commented,

> The teachers know that what we say works because either they've seen us do it or they've done it themselves with our help. That kind of thing has a tremendous amount of impact . . . [in contrast to] going in and listening to someone lecture to you and then watching them drive away . . . .

Richie, Olivares, and Naumann were examples of good teachers whose

skills the clinical professors had helped improve. As Beeler said several times during our visit, repeating an adage she had heard at a conference, "You don't have to be sick to get better." In fact, Beeler observed, the good teachers "are the ones you have the most effect with. If they ask for help, they're going to follow through, and they have the kind of skills to follow through with a little assistance."

The clinical professors also worked with less able teachers. Often these teachers were referred to the professors because their problems had become apparent to others, usually guidance counselors or principals. At Springstead High School, Follman checked in often with Cathy Hansen, the head of the guidance department. She functioned informally as an early-warning system on teachers having trouble. "A lot of times when teachers are having a problem with their teaching," she said, "we [guidance counselors] are the first ones to know about it . . . We get students coming in about the same teacher." Teachers also come in on their own, she noted, "because the setting is just one that invites them to come in."

That year, for example, students' reports had alerted her to a first-year teacher who was having difficulty making the transition from student to authority figure. She approached the teacher herself, gently, but he was very defensive, so she enlisted Follman's help. Later she asked the first-year teacher how he had liked working with Follman. She related,

> He said that what Dr. Follman did most for him . . . was to boost his self-esteem, to make him feel like it was okay to be a first-year teacher, and then to give him some specific things [to do] so that things did go better in the classroom and he felt better about himself as a teacher.

Principals too referred teachers to the clinical professors, but usually less directly and less obviously. Beeler explained, "Principals can say [to a teacher with a poor evaluation], 'Here are some options--teacher center, clinical professor, etc.--you choose.' But they don't say, 'Do this, or Do that.'" Springstead High School's principal, Bob Turner, admitted that he sometimes went further: "I'll see John [Follman] in the hall occasionally and say, 'How about checking in with a particular person?' But I frankly do not follow up to find out whether he has or not." Turner's attitude was best illustrated by the following exchange:

> Q. Have you found it effective to have the professors work with teachers without reporting to you?
>
> A. In the long range, yes.
>
> Q. In the short range you have some hesitations?
>
> A. No, I don't have any hesitations. But I'm not saying to a clinical professor, "Go in and work with this person, and let's talk about it and see what kind of progress he's

making." But over a period of time, things improve.

Turner described such a case--a teacher whom he had personally observed to have almost no control at all over students, who had in time improved noticeably.

Of course, not all teachers improved with a clinical professor's help. Hansen could not think of any teacher whom Follman had not been able to help. But Turner recalled two teachers from his earlier assignment at Spring Hill Elementary School who had in effect been counseled out of teaching by clinical professor Bob Shannon. Turner had suggested Shannon work with these two, presumably because of negative evaluations. Shannon was not able to "save" the teachers, said Beeler. "It was just too much--you can't change behavior that quickly." But he did help the teachers' students survive the year under them, she went on. "He fed in some things that helped the kids . . . . , some alternatives and some rearrangements of aides and other systems, and advice . . . ."

Beeler stressed that neither the teachers who had been "saved" nor those who had left the system, would have worked with a clinical professor at all had the interactions not been confidential. The teachers were free to gripe, to fail, without fear that someone in authority would be informed. A corollary of the confidentiality of the interactions was their nonsupervisory nature. The clinical professors had no authority themselves and were not obliged to make recommendations to any school official regarding the retention, the probation, the dismissal, the demotion, the promotion, or the transfer of any teacher with whom they worked. "That's a nice feeling," said Hansen. "You're just learning; nobody's judging you."

Of course, Hansen pointed out, "if you do better, and [the clinical professor] wants to write a reference for you saying you did, he can do that, and the principal sees it."

The confidentiality and the nonsupervisory nature of the interactions were appreciated by the good teachers as well. Richie attested to that:

> If you want to sit there and moan and groan about the paperwork that you've gotta do and the rules that you've gotta follow that you don't agree with, there is no threat there. They don't trip over their feet trying to get to the administration to tell them that you are unhappy about a certain situation. What they try to do instead is help you cope with that situation.

Because the clinical professors had the confidence of the principals and the teachers with whom they worked, they were free to come and go in a school without checking in with the principal (except perhaps as a courtesy). In many schools across the country such a practice would not be tolerated, for some principals feel they must be privy to all that goes on in their school. Not so in Hernando County. "We have had excellent cooperation from administrators," Beeler said. "They have allowed the

professors almost free rein. They do not ask questions."

Despite this cooperation, not all principals were supportive of the program, according to Olivares, who spoke at that point not as a teacher-client of the clinical professors but as the president of the Hernando County Teachers Association. None are "outwardly nonsupporters," she said, but about a third of them have a "chipped-in-stone that's-a-weird-way-of-doing-it" attitude. To them, she continued, "if it's not going to be documented and used toward an evaluation, or if they can't see any concrete change in a teacher, then it's not worth it."

We asked Olivares whether the clinical professors were ever seen as taking the side of teachers or administrators. She had seen some subtle changes over the years, she said. She did not imply that these changes constituted a betrayal of teachers; rather, she suggested that the professors had moderated their behavior. She remarked,

> In the beginning they were more like us . . . Now they've got a program they don't want to see go down the tubes, and they're a little like [the administrators]. They still try to be like us, on our side, and I don't mean to say we're at war, but attitudes have changed a little, and you can see it in subtle little ways . . . They don't want to see the administration and the school board fighting against them, so they might not be quite as outspoken or flamboyant or unorthodox . . . You want a precise example? We have a clinical professor who used to wear sandals and jeans and a shirt. He was one of us. As the program developed, you'd never see him without a tie and close-toed shoes.

Of course, other factors may have influenced that professor's behavior, such as pressure from his department head to present a "professional image" in the field.

The clinical professors worked with teachers not only one-to-one but also as small groups, department faculties, school leadership teams, and so on. For example, one year Silverman and Manker helped Richie, Olivares, Dennis Morrissey, and Jeff Caruthers as pod-mates at Mitchel Black Elementary School. The pod work came about because, said Richie,

> in this situation, to separate yourself from the other three classes is almost torturous. You can't live in a space this large with 120 kids and three other adults and attempt to do your own thing. There's too much conflict. I learned that on my own. What Stu brought to us was a solution to the problem--doing as much as you can together.

The year she and her pod-mates worked with Silverman and Manker was "like energy unbounding," Richie went on. "The clinical professors came in with ideas and things, and we went on field trips and did things that

the other classes did not do." Their pod--all 124--went to Disneyworld, for example. No class had done that before. The pod did so much, said Richie, that other teachers developed some animosity toward the four of them. Eventually, however, after "about two years of foolproof trips . . . , other teachers started to venture out."

What had the students in their pod learned as a result? we asked.

Richie responded,

> I don't think there's anything that they're learning any better or any worse as far as the academic curriculum [is concerned]. The hidden curriculum--that's another story. Especially the two years that Dennis, Jeff, Karen, and I worked together, I think the kids picked up on our camaraderie.

"Don't you think so?" she said to Olivares.

Olivares quickly replied, "You couldn't miss it."

Richie went on, "The four of us would be dancing in the aisles some days, I mean literally dancing in the aisles, and the kids knew that we were thick."

On a slightly larger scale than the pod, mathematics educator Lichtenberg spent the entire 1980-81 school year helping the six math faculty members at D.S. Parrott Junior High School develop more continuity in their curriculum and introduce more originality into their teaching. After consultation with Beeler and Lichtenberg, a faculty meeting was set up, which Beeler described as "just kind of a "Here's-Betty-she's-available type of thing . . . and let's talk about our department in general." One meeting grew into regular meetings, every week or every other week. Lichtenberg also worked with some teachers individually, helping them improve their skills and demonstrating techniques.

An important need that emerged in Lichtenberg's work with this faculty was for some different ways to teach math and motivate students. Lichtenberg began bringing in items such as fraction slide rules made with paper, talking about the theory behind the items, showing teachers how the items could be used, and suggesting questions the teachers could ask students when they introduced the items into the classroom. At the next session, then, she would ask how the item she had brought in the previous week had worked, and teachers would share their experiences with it as well as their ideas for adapting it to other purposes. Said Lichtenberg,

> Often I just presented the idea cold. Occasionally a very able math teacher on the faculty would elaborate, and sometimes the other teachers would pick it up and say, "I bet you could do this with it."

> So it turned out to be a very effective training session for them, not in terms of looking at materials that somebody else gives you, but in terms of asking themselves the question, "How could I modify that and use it in my own class?"

Out of those many sessions in which activities were presented, discussed, critiqued, and adapted came a booklet called Math Activities for Junior High School. Several of the activities were written by Lichtenberg, but most were written by the teachers themselves. Three were computer programs written by ninth graders. Lichtenberg arranged for the teachers to be on the program of the Florida Council of Teachers of Mathematics meeting in fall 1981. She reported,

> They took copies of their book with them, they did a tremendous presentation with transparencies and demonstrations, and [they] even had a microcomputer where they demonstrated some of the programs that a ninth grade class had written. They had a tremendous positive reaction to that from the people that were there, and when I talked to them in October and November, they were just absolutely aglow about the whole experience and sharing the book, sharing the ideas, with the people in Miami.

A large-group effort taken on by clinical professors Silverman and Manker at Springstead High School involved building pride among the school community. Serving a relatively new housing development with a high rate of transience, the high school was very young and unstable. When Turner took over in 1979 as its third principal in four years, there was a 50-percent turnover in the student population every year between August and June. With advice and assistance from the two clinical professors, Turner launched what came to be called Project Pride (Hernando County-style; not to be confused with a national project by the same name). It began with a week-long summer leadership conference involving 27 young people, teachers, parents, and administrators, the primary aim of which was to identify the school's problems, plan some ways to solve or ameliorate them, and organize to implement the plans. Silverman and Manker functioned as conference facilitators.

Among the problems the leadership group identified were the instability of the administration, the instability of the faculty, the faculty's attitudes toward the students, and the lack of parent involvement. "Mostly, though," said Turner, "the problems of youngsters in identifying with the school at all. At all."

There were conference sessions on communication skills, problem solving, and morale building. The idea was "getting people to know one another," Manker said. Students got to feel that they could go to the principal and talk. That was something new. Both students and administrators learned a bit about the use of authority. One result was setting up a rotating committee to deal with discipline. To do this, administrators relinquished some of their authority to students. Project

Pride helped to make students more responsive and responsible. For example, the year before the project, the school could not hold class elections because nobody would run for office. After the leadership conference there were candidates for all offices, many of whom had been conference participants.

Teachers were not the only school personnel with whom Hernando County's clinical professors worked. They worked with parents and teacher aides as well, usually in workshops--for example, sessions for parents on reading and math activities to do with their children, and programs for new primary school aides on helping children learn basic skills.

A particularly unusual project involving clinical professors Lichtenberg and Andria Troutman was the development of a series of eight videotapes on elementary school math concepts and skills that were repeatedly showing up on state-assessment tests as students' areas of weakness--for example, place value, addition and subtraction, and fractions. Sheila High, a district-wide primary specialist (that is, a curriculum resource person for teachers), related how the series had come about: Muriel Krueger, a primary specialist based at Moton School Center, had been casting about for ways to help Moton teachers and aides learn to use some equipment available at the school (Cuisenaire rods, Lots-a-Links, and the like) to which they had never been exposed. She wanted them to be able to learn at the school, during school hours. Already available to her were three videotapes that featured Troutman conducting a workshop for kindergarten aides. These tapes had been filmed for another purpose and then found to be useful for inservice training. More videotapes seemed to be the answer. Krueger presented the idea to High, who enlisted Lichtenberg to do five videotapes, four in which Krueger, High, and a primary school aide were the "trainees" and one in which Lichtenberg worked with three third graders. The tapes, ranging in length from 20 to 35 minutes, were designed for teachers to use on their own, during their planning period. After viewing one, a teacher who wanted to earn an inservice point could make an appointment with a primary specialist to be observed demonstrating an activity presented in the tape.

The series had just been finished when we visited and only two tapes had been shown to two faculties, so no one could give us much information on their effectiveness or popularity with teachers. Barbara Gundersdorff, a second grade teacher at Moton School Center Bypass who had seen the videotape on place value and the one using the children, preferred the latter because of the children. On the former, she commented,

> I, for one, enjoyed it . . . I saw that it was a good method of teaching teachers to teach children. But some of the comments from the teachers were that it was too elementary or below their level . . . And it was too formal, the teachers said.

Lichtenberg uses the same approach in live workshops, Beeler noted, "and teachers always feel positive about that approach."

Over the years the clinical professors' work with teachers one-to-one and in groups had produced several spin-offs. Chief among these were county-based courses oriented to teachers' needs and a county-based graduate program collaboratively designed by USF faculty and local participants. Evidence of benefits from these spin-offs was abundant. Silverman described one with an unusually wide effect. Three or four faculty members from Springstead High School who had enrolled in the graduate program identified as one of their goals the alleviation of the discipline problem at their school, so the USF site faculty (Silverman among them) helped them design coursework and fieldwork oriented toward that goal. Two of them--the dean of students and a teacher--designed a "time-out room" for the school that was available to all the teachers. Teachers sent disruptive students to the room, where trained faculty volunteers counseled them according to a set of principles laid out by the room's designers. The students were encouraged to come up with a plan for dealing with the problems that had gotten them there.

In a related development, about 10 teachers in that school (out of 50) had taken a basic course in reality therapy taught by Silverman, and some others had been introduced to reality therapy in a workshop. If you peeked into classrooms when teachers were not looking, said Silverman,

> you'd probably find 10 or 12 teachers using that stuff relatively consistently, you'd find another 5 or 10 using it on and off, and you'd find some for whom it's not a comfortable approach, . . . not one that they choose to use.

"But they still might use the time-out room," Beeler noted.

Was discipline less of a problem now? we asked.

Silverman responded, "The dean claims that it is. The dean claims that he is getting fewer kids to his office--the ultimate step."

Beeler chimed in that statistics supported the dean's claims. She explained that Springstead High School definitely had fewer expulsions now than the other high school in the county. The downward trend had begun about the time the time-out room and the reality-therapy courses had started.

Thus far, our story has focused on the benefits of the clinical-professor service for teachers and other school personnel. What about the benefits for the clinical professors and the university?

The clinical-professor program formally dated from 1978, but Silverman had been working in Hernando County for about eight years before that, having begun when USF launched its first off-campus degree programs. From time to time in the early years he had done a little "clinical professoring"; that is, Roger Landers, then the principal at Mitchel Black Elementary School, would occasionally say, "Listen, as long as you're here,

we have a teacher who . . . " or "we have a student who . . . " Then, in 1973, the Florida legislature passed the Teacher Education Center Act, which allocated to the counties $5 per student for inservice education, $3 of which had to go to a teacher education center for noncredit inservice activities. Additional funds were allocated to universities for support of teacher-education-center activities. In Hernando County, on the assumption that teachers and administrators liked the one-to-one contact with a clinical professor, the work was stepped up through a creative combination of university-sponsored credit-granting activities and teacher-education-center-sponsored noncredit follow-up in the classroom. Said Silverman, "Over the last six or seven years I guess we've probably had 30 or 40 people come up to work individually with teachers in the classrooms." In 1978, with the award of a federal Teacher Centers grant, this scattered activity was formalized as the clinical-professor program, and four USF faculty members were hired to work for the teacher education center one-quarter to one-half time.

On the basis of their teacher-education-center work, some of those 30 or 40 people fared well at USF in terms of raises, and some were even promoted, up until two years ago, said Phil Pfost, USF's director of teacher-education-center activities. But under the current guidelines, he told us, "no one's been promoted based on teacher-education-center work, and they're not going to be" because "scholarly productivity and academic work are getting increasingly important . . ." This was not Pfost's own inclination, nor that of the college of education's dean, for both saw the destiny of the college as lying in teacher-education-center activities. But, said Pfost, the college is "beginning to gradually get in the bind of a professional school that's got a strong inservice orientation, in a university that's moving toward a more traditional, scholarly pattern."

Among Silverman, Lichtenberg, Follman, and Manker, that development did not pose a personal problem because they had already gained tenure and full professorships. The problem lay in attracting new, young faculty members to clinical-professor work. That meant generating a comprehensive plan for recruitment, training, rewards, and the like, not just capitalizing on people who had the interest, and the luxury of rank and tenure, to get involved. Pfost admitted that they had probably gone at the problem piecemeal and that they certainly had not documented their teacher-education-center work well.

The Hernando County Teacher Education Center itself had little documentation on the clinical-professor program, clearly a weakness if ever the teacher-oriented program would need justification. "It was never built in," said Beeler, in part because of the confidentiality. The clinical professors turn in written reports every year, she pointed out, but "they're very broad statements. They don't mention names."

Early in our interviewing, when the contract problem came up, Beeler remarked, "The teacher education center survived pretty well initially. Our council members continued to come even though people were

working to the rule . . . People came to activities. But even we are beginning to be affected." A little later she ventured the opinion that what had sustained interest in the center so long and what had sustained many of the teachers, were the programs which we had been talking about--the clinical professors, Project Pride, reality therapy, and so on. If those programs had not worked, she observed, "I don't think the teacher center image would be as positive as it is to this day."

"Are you saying that those coping and problem-solving systems have substantially helped the people weather a difficult time in morale?" we asked.

"I think so," she replied. "Reality therapy in itself says, 'There is something you as a person can do,' . . . and because a lot of teachers have had that, it took a long time for them to become caught up in the downhill slide."

If that was true, it was a telling victory for the program.

Although Hernando is the second-fastest-growing county in Florida, it is small and rural. Major sources of income for residents are agriculture and rock mines. There is also a large population of retirees.

The Hernando County Teacher Education Center is within walking distance of half the county's schools. It serves about 450 teachers and administrators in two high schools, two junior high schools, five elementary schools, one primary school, and one adult education school. The student population in the system is approximately 7,300.

The building housing the center may be the only one in the country that was constructed expressly to be a teacher center and was built by students in the school system the teacher center serves. Located in a wooded area owned by the county but not big enough to accommodate a large building, the structure contains a big meeting/resource room, a storage area, one office, a reception area, and a bathroom. The students who built it--from the adult education day school--did all the work except the wiring. They even cut down and milled the cypress and the pine that frame it.

This chapter is based on a site visit to Hernando County, Florida, on April 29, 1982. Persons who were interviewed and provided assistance in gathering data were Elaine Beeler, director, Hernando County Teacher Education Center, Barbara Gundersdorff, second grade teacher, Moton School Center Bypass, and policy board member, Hernando County Teacher Education Center, Cathy Hansen, guidance counselor, Springstead High School; Sheila High, district primary specialist, Hernando County Schools; Sara Johnson, fourth grade Chapter I teacher, Eastside Elementary School; Betty Lichtenberg, clinical professor, Hernando County Teacher Education Center, and professor of mathematics education, University of South Florida; Charles Manker, former clinical professor, Hernando County Teacher Education Center, and former professor of educational psychology, University of South Florida, now retired; Dave Naumann, band director, Springstead High School; Karen Olivares, sixth grade teacher, Mitchel Black Elementary School, and president, Hernando County Teachers Association; Phil Pfost, director of teacher-education-center activities and professor of reading education, University of South Florida; Maureen Richie, sixth grade teacher, Mitchel Black Elementary School; Stuart Silverman, clinical professor, Hernando County Teacher Education Center, and professor of educational psychology, University of South Florida; and Bob Turner, principal, Springstead High School.

Reshaping a Teacher Center After Federal Funding: Madison County Teacher Center, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville

A long, gradual hill rises from the banks of the Mississippi River opposite St. Louis, Missouri, up to Edwardsville, Illinois. Madison County, encompassing Edwardsville but stretching eastward, is mostly farm country, although there are a few urban settings.

The Madison County Teacher Center (MCTC) was established in the first round of federal funding for teacher centers, in 1978. It was created to serve the county's 15 school districts, whose teacher populations ranged from 30 to 700.

The MCTC's survival through spring 1982 is exemplary: It illustrates what a teacher center goes through in struggling for life after federal funding. The story also demonstrates how one teacher center was institutionalized and what changes were required philosophically, operationally, and programmatically.

Until 1981 the MCTC was officially connected to Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville (SIUE) only loosely, through representatives on the policy board. In 1981 the MCTC became part of SIUE's school of education. University sponsorship of the MCTC was not the first choice of any of the parties involved, not even the university people. Moreover, MCTC's survival as a teacher center is still uncertain. At issue are whether a teacher center can survive with a university as its base, how much the MCTC will gradually change its character and become something different, whether it can continue to attract teachers, and whether it can continue to get support from school administrators, who control part of its funds.

SIUE was involved in developing the teacher center from its beginning. Don Baden, the associate dean of the school of education, wrote the original proposal. Ray Althoff, a teacher and the first director of the center, reported, "Don wrote the proposal and it was critiqued and added to by policy board members . . . . Both the Illinois Federation of Teachers and the Illinois Education Association were involved--a lot of involvement. Both groups were concerned with the center . . . ."

Gene Briggs, the regional superintendent of Madison County, initiated the proposal. Briggs is one of 57 elected administrators in Illinois who sit between local districts and the state department of education. He received the federal announcement inviting proposals and convened the university people, the teachers, the administrators, and the others required to form the original policy board and develop a proposal. He also ran interference for the teacher center concept. Baden recalled that Briggs had done yeoman work: "Where there were administrators who resisted . . . . , he used the force of his diplomacy in urging people to give it a chance . . . That enabled us to be successful." Briggs told me that he had "tried to assure administrators that the teacher center would not be a tool of the teacher organizations. That was not the intent and

was not going to be the direction it would take." As it turned out, Briggs was right. Far from resisting the teacher center, administrators became its advocates. By 1981 administrators in adjacent counties had gotten interested enough to join in a consortium of counties being formed to sponsor the teacher center in its fourth year of operation. Shirley Bellm, a special education teacher in the Highland Community Schools, said, "We [now] have a pretty good feeling between a lot of principals and teachers . . . When we started the teacher center, there were some administrators, even in our district, who had fears that teachers were going to try to take over inservice education. But I think over the years they've found we're not a threat, we're a help."

Like most teacher centers when they started, the MCTC was a blend of distinctive and common features. Its distinctive feature was its "satellite centers," that is, resource rooms that were spread across the county so that no teacher was more than 15-20 minutes from one. In a more common vein there were workshops, usually held at the satellite centers, short in duration, dealing with topics such as discipline, finger math, science, art, puppetry, right brain and left brain, and burnout and stress. There were also teacher forums, for which the center brought in nationally known speakers on a particular topic, for example, the gifted child or drug and alcohol abuse. Finally there was a program to share resources, such as books and films.

To get activity going in these areas the MCTC policy board sought out what teachers wanted and needed. Sharon Rinderer, the chairperson of the policy board, said,

> Originally we did a needs assessment. There was a form sent out to every teacher in Madison County--3,500 or something like that, [in] both public and parochial schools. That's where we started from. After that, the policy board would get feedback from teachers in their districts about what they wanted.

Most of the early workshops were for just one day, Saturday usually, and they were held at places like the Holiday Inn or on the SIUE campus. Many were conducted by teachers. Dennis Pluta, formerly the MCTC's inservice coordinator, told me how these teachers were chosen: "We selected them on recommendations from each policy board member, and through word of mouth [from other teachers and administrators], and through going out into a district and finding out who would be good at this or that."

The policy board also sent out a questionnaire asking teachers if they had talents and special skills that they would be willing to share.

So the MCTC took several approaches to rounding up teachers with special abilities and experience, enabling it to tap a previously unused talent pool.

There was always an evaluation at the end of each workshop so that the MCTC staff got feedback on the kind of job that teachers (and professors) were doing.

Pluta reported, "As the center developed, there were more workshops of longer duration." Sometimes these developed from the shorter workshops. Special education teacher Bellm illustrated how her early exposure to teacher center activity had led to other opportunities and different experiences. Remembering the first few workshops she had attended, she remarked, "It was kind of nice to meet and know other teachers. We got to the point where we could say, 'Oh, I saw you at this one, and are you doing that?' It was a good mixer type of thing." Shortly, however, Bellm's involvement became much more intense. She recalled,

> We had Ed Lieberthal come from McGraw-Hill in New York, and he gave us a four-hour session on finger math. Finger math is like Chisanbop . . . It's basically adding, subtracting, multiplying, and dividing with your 10 fingers . . . I learned enough to get me started, and then we got the books, and I was to go on from there on my own.

That developed into Bellm's doing some teaching at SIUE. She herself had been taking a class in special education at SIUE. Just about the time the finger-math books arrived, her professor, Eric Blackhurst, asked his students to do a criterion measure. She decided to use the finger math. "According to the books there are 99 objectives," said Bellm. "I narrowed them down to 66 for my purpose." After reading Bellm's report of her criterion measures, Blackhurst decided to include finger math among the math-teaching methods he was using in a research project with learning-disabled children. Bellm related,

> In the process I went into his undergraduate classes and taught his students finger math for an hour and a half, which is really fun--trying to take four hours [worth of material] and do it in one-and-a-half hours. I also trained the teachers in his project. Well, to make a long story short, he wrote to the Council for Exceptional Children, and we were able to present [what we were doing] at their national convention in Houston.

What this amounted to was the establishment of a kind of collaboration between a teacher and a professor. The professor would tell his students about his project, and that would lead into finger math. Then Bellm would take over to teach the finger movements. She would respond to the class as a teacher, and the professor would answer as a theorist.

Bellm told us,

> I think college teaching has changed as a result of the teacher center . . . I've seen a lot more . . . asking if there is anything that teachers want to know, want to concentrate on,

want to touch on . . . in the last couple, three courses . . .

Another result of Bellm's involvement in finger math was that the idea spread, not only in her school, but across the county. Elementary as well as special education teachers picked up the use of finger math, all in ways appropriate to their particular students. And with Blackhurst's investigation there were teachers in different school districts who were using finger math with a research approach.

The activities of the MCTC enlarged its circle of supporters. Here are some representative comments from the growing cadre of enthusiasts:

> Rinderer: It's the personal contact that works--from a credible colleague, somebody that you respect and who knows what they're talking about . . .
>
> Mary Lou Sickbert, a kindergarten teacher and a policy board member: The workshops kept everyone coming together, and we had some really wonderful workshops . . . It was a teacher thing where teachers went . . . It made for a lot of camaraderie. Teachers would get together and work together. We'd get to know teachers from other schools.
>
> Margaret Leyda, a media specialist: Teachers who have acquired knowledge through their experience and training are being used in the teacher center.

The activities of the MCTC also enlarged the world of the teacher. Rinderer elaborated on the latter point:

> The center exposed me to educational thought, educational research, current things outside my district, outside my county, outside the state of Illinois. I come from a relatively small district, and they don't send a lot of teachers to national conventions because they can't afford it. So a lot of the speakers that I was able to hear through the teacher center were new experiences for me. I was exposed to things I'd never heard before . . . One that sticks in my mind was a presentation by Adele Faber and Elaine Mazlish, two women who had studied with Haim Ginott . . . I thought they were fantastic.

Over the teacher center's first three years, the word spread in southern Illinois. People in adjacent counties heard that the teacher center was succeeding in Madison County. Neither the Illinois Education Association nor the Illinois Federation of Teachers had taken it over.

The teachers and the regional superintendent in nearby Macoupin County were among the southern Illinois educators whose interest was roused by the MCTC. Russ Masinelli, Macoupin's regional superintendent,

put it this way: "In the past administrators put on inservice programs . . . We felt it would be much better going to the teachers, who know what their needs are . . . , with the teacher center concept." Some administrators, of course, had always felt that way, but there were many who had come to see the value of practitioner involvement because the teacher center had demonstrated it.

Macoupin was one of the counties added in 1981 as the service area of the MCTC expanded. Reflecting on the county's decision to participate, Masinelli remarked, "I think we have brought our entire county much closer together. For the first time we're getting complaints from some school districts that we didn't run a particular inservice program in their district."

Once Macoupin County began participating, its teachers were also sought out to run workshops. Masinelli recalled one Christmas when elementary school teachers had said that they needed some kind of crafts training to help their students make fancy things for Christmas:

> We found out we had one of the most spectacular people for this job right in our own backyard, a teacher, Louann Brown. She ran a workshop for teachers in which a wealth of ideas were developed, things kids could make for Christmas--ornaments, decorations, cards, gifts, etc.--with suggestions about what might be appropriate at particular grade levels. We printed a book describing and illustrating all these ideas. We charged teachers $2.00 for the inservice, and that included a copy of the product.

The product, a 62-page booklet printed in manuscript and illustrated by Brown, sold far beyond the workshop. Christmas Crafts for the Classroom has remained an attractive resource for teachers and stands as a lasting illustration of Brown's talent and creativity.

The MCTC not only gained teacher support and joiners from other counties; it also won the endorsement of the administration at SIUE's school of education. Dean Joseph Gore admitted candidly that his motivations were not all selfless. "The existence of a school of education depends on its capacity to keep faculty occupied during a time of low enrollment," he said, but he also expressed a variety of other reasons for college involvement in teacher-centered inservice education. "We've been talking about establishing a consortium [something in addition to the teacher center] that would include the university, people from the schools, the state department--a kind of regional effort at school improvement."

I asked the dean what he meant by "school improvement" because I understood that the teacher center focused on teachers' needs. His response:

> It makes sense to focus on the needs and interests of teachers as a means of improving schools. I think meeting the needs of teachers, responding to their interests, is a very fundamental step toward improving schools . . . That's one reason why the notion of a teacher center caught fire--because it was recognized that maybe other efforts to improve schools really hadn't solicited very much from teachers . . . . So I don't see any incompatibility in interests to improve schools and addressing the needs and interests of teachers.

Those were pretty impressive words coming from a dean of education. I wondered out loud whether the dean thought his faculty were ready to follow through on his rhetoric; whether to do so, they might not also need some inservice education; and how that might be handled. His answer was,

> Oh yes, that [inservice education for faculty] may be a fairly formidable impediment . . . [We are] providing more opportunity for faculty to become involved [with schools and teachers] . . . We're developing a liaison network . . . , an arrangement whereby we've encouraged professors to come into contact with schools.

To reward professors for such activity, the college had worked out a system such that time spent with schools could be accumulated. It was a kind of credit system for professors to earn public-service units (PSUs), some of which could be converted into travel money and other perquisites.

The dean continued,

> I think we have made a very modest and interesting beginning through the PSU work here to get faculty out into the schools far more than they were. At times we've had maybe 40 projects in a year. For a place this size, that's really remarkable.

Providing faculty who work extensively in schools with a reward system and with credibility within a university is often difficult. I asked about that. The dean responded,

> I think there's general acceptance that a professional school, particularly a school of education, has a different work domain and that our work has to go forward in ways that don't look exactly like the academic's. On the other hand there is some tension about the quality of scholarship in schools of education. I take the position that you don't need to sacrifice scholarly quality because the emphasis is clinical work, the training function, or practice as opposed to theory . . . In a professional school the focus has to be on practice, but that can lead to very exciting and interesting intellectual stuff, even the formulation of theory.

Achieving compatibility between a professional school of education and a teacher center has often proved difficult. It might have been easier at SIUE than at many other places because the dean and at least some faculty saw the mission of the school of education (as a professional school) as primarily the preparation of education personnel. Dean Gore thought that the school's mission should be precisely defined. "Part of that," he said, ". . . is building and strengthening the involvement and relationship between the professional school and the public schools. The teacher center is one way to strengthen that relationship."

In some ways I found Dean Gore's discourse on SIUE's philosophy and stance in relation to the teacher center rather lofty and idealistic compared with the descriptions I had heard of one-shot affairs called workshops that provided a quick fix for discipline, stress and burnout, finger math, etc. I wondered, Had there been some plan or scheme at the teacher center to start with quick fixes and gradually move to more substantive, in-depth inservice education? Arnette Rauschel, the teacher center program officer at Illinois's state department of education, worked closely with many centers in the state. She had this observation:

> I think Baden and Althoff had a sequence of development in mind. There were some earlier discussions about first having to use a Bandaid approach and then progressing to--or evolving to--where you have teachers involved in more substantive types of activities and thinking. You remember one of the teacher center objectives was a teacher forum. That implies a different level of activity from make-and-take.

Pluta endorsed the longer, more substantive activities, but also defended the one-shot workshops: "Some are needed. Some are very good. Sometimes you don't want more than a one-time shot. It depends on the nature of the materials."

Althoff had still another shade of meaning when he said, "We realized after the first year that we had reached a plateau in many of our workshops. We tried to build on the beginnings so that each year we would get more sophisticated."

The plan to expand the service area of the teacher center to encompass two more southern Illinois counties was conceived in the hope of a fourth year of federal funding. But the proposal for federal funding beyond the third year was not successful. To survive, the teacher center had to find other sources of support. Those ultimately turned out to be a combination of local, regional, and university resources and funds. Madison County Regional Superintendent Briggs mentioned one source:

> Last year we directed some of the money we generated from the certificate-renewal fee to the teacher center because we saw the teacher center as a viable inservice tool.

Making the transition was difficult and at times frustrating and disillusioning, particularly to teachers who had depended so directly on teacher center funds to either take or conduct workshops. Activities sponsored by the center continued. There were not as many activities, and certainly there was not money to free teachers as there had been with federal support. Nevertheless, Ann Rauh, a kindergarten teacher who conducted workshops in arts and crafts, told us that the track record the center had developed was continuing to attract teachers. "One evidence I have is that I'm still getting calls to do more workshops," she said. In contrast, Sickbert reflected teacher disillusionment when she observed that the satellite centers were not being used as extensively as before and were not as well stocked with materials. "There just hasn't been that much money to do those things. Also," she lamented, "it doesn't seem quite as much a teacher thing as it did before."

Sickbert continued, "There aren't too many policy board meetings anymore. They were regular before." Baden corroborated this: "We have met less often. We very honestly have had a fall-off . . . ." But, he said, "we expected [that] once federal funding was over."

Recognizing who was represented when Baden said "we" was a problem. Teachers living more circumscribed lives in classrooms had seen less of the larger scene. Sickbert characterized the teachers' perspective when she remarked,

> Yes, I was in on some of that [discussion of proposal changes by the policy board], but I . . . guess I was in limbo when it changed--not quite realizing all that was going on. But I do know it was discussed . . . . Baden has tried to do a job out there [at the university], but it just isn't the same.

Despite the reductions in budget and the expansion in the area served by the center, Rinderer (policy board chair) said, "There are enough teachers committed to it, involved in it, who've attended workshops, who've used the satellite rooms . . . I think there are enough that want to keep it going . . . They know there's something good there."

The test at Edwardsville will be what becomes of the spirit and the involvement, the commitment and the satisfaction, in the transition from adequate funding to a spartan budget. How to handle that transition was problematic. Baden expressed his view:

> One choice is to gradually taper down and have a declining profile. I think it's perhaps more effective to go cold turkey and to drop that profile pretty drastically the first year and then begin to rebuild . . . because if you're always declining, the implication is that the teacher center is getting less and less. If you go down suddenly and then begin to build back up, you create something new, which I think has to be done.

When the MCTC's sources of support changed, the balance of influence changed as well. But the pendulum did not swing all the way back to administrator-directed inservice education. Administrators like Masinelli now had more of a chance to make suggestions, but teachers still made many of the decisions. They had a voice in what was offered by the teacher center, and certainly, as long as teacher center activities were voluntary, they would decide whether to attend.

Part of what trying to survive prompted was a look at how decisions were and should be made at the teacher center. At MCTC leadership initially came from the director and the teachers who were active on the policy board, but with strong support from Baden at the university and with the backing of the fiscal agent (the regional superintendent). Even before the transition, the university's involvement was probably greater than in most non-university-based teacher centers. The MCTC was physically located on the university campus, and that had an influence. Also, the heavy involvement of an associate dean was more than the level of involvement of most university persons sitting on teacher center policy boards.

One might ask why, at a teachers' center, teachers were not more proactive. There were many reasons. Teachers were only beginning to take charge of their own inservice education at the center. Whatever was done was almost by necessity fragmented, that is, spread across the county, including only a few teachers from any school, and attacking topics piecemeal. Teachers may also have hesitated to be proactive because they were not encouraged by the existing social system to do anything very different. If teachers improve discipline, for example, or the ability of students to write, that is okay. But if they do anything really substantial to change the nature of school or the curriculum, that will probably be questioned. Administrative prerogatives are fairly jealously guarded. Administrators are usually quite willing to let teachers do things that will improve a school, as long as those things do not upset the power balance.

I asked Baden who in this time after federal funding was deciding what teacher center activities would be offered. He replied,

> In the last year it has probably been more driven by what was available, what I thought was possible . . . , what I could get in terms of workshops, what policy board members thought teachers needed, in some cases what district administrators said they would like to have.

One of the myths about teacher centers has been that most everything is decided by teachers. The fact is that teacher center staff often introduce activities. Insightful, energetic staff have extraordinary intuition in anticipating teachers' interests and needs. Althoff, the MCTC's director for the first three years, apparently had that talent. Since the university assumed major responsibility for the teacher center,

there have also been staff initiatives. As an example, there was an attempt to attract secondary school teachers by offering an update for science teachers. "We had a lot of support from the biology and physics departments on campus and also from one of the other colleges [Blackburn] in the area, and we had an excellent turnout," Baden related. The little bit of funding required for the science update was provided by a federally funded regional group.

It was clear that over the three-year period of federal funding, the teacher center had served the purposes of teachers, administrators, and education service regions. Perhaps it had done so for different people in different ways, but all agreed that continuing the teacher center was essential and a worthy gamble, even though sources of funding were uncertain and reduced.

The transition obviously involved more than a change in financial support. It brought a general reappraisal, not only of the teacher center but of inservice education more broadly. Although many endorsed the teacher center because it had satisfied teachers, others were beginning to work at school improvement. A part of the reappraisal was considering the role teachers played in the teacher center and, perhaps more subtly, the roles other people involved in supporting the center would have. The MCTC leadership wanted more than an emphasis on who was in charge. They were searching for a new arrangement--actual involvement in inservice education by teachers and administrators. In Macoupin County, where a local policy board was just being formed, I got the sense that teachers would have not only a greater appearance of power, but also much more actual power in what was being done. At the same time, the effort would be collaborative.

I asked Baden whether teachers had developed a more profound concept of inservice education--what it was or should be--in three years of teacher center work. He replied, "I'd like to think so, although at times I still see teachers wanting immediate remedies in a short session. I'm guilty of providing that."

This was a Catch-22 situation. There was the need to change, to respond to new funding sources. There had been growth in the concept of inservice education, but not among everyone. Some administrators wanted more involvement in the teacher center because it had worked, but they wanted to feel that they had some control. The teacher center label represented a concept, both loved and feared, yet people were reacting more to what they interpreted "teacher center" to mean than what it actually was. Finally, there was the movement in thought from dealing primarily with individual inservice education to addressing the social system called school, which meant emphasizing school improvement rather than individual development. Would these two purposes inevitably be in conflict at the MCTC? I had raised that question with Dean Gore. I posed it again with Baden. His response was,

We have a plan growing out of John Goodlad's study of schooling

> that is directed at school improvement. In a sense that's not teacher center, but in a sense there's a lot of spin-off [from the teacher center]. I don't think something like this needs to be called a teacher center for it to accomplish what teacher centers are trying to accomplish. In the school-improvement concept we could find out what a school needs from doing a contextual appraisal, and teachers would be involved. And whether the words "teacher center" would have anything to do with that, I don't know.

Baden said he didn't have a clear idea of where the MCTC was going. He did describe his thinking about the whole enterprise in ways that suggested he knew where he personally wanted to go. For example, he was administering both the teacher center and the university outreach program, and he admitted that if he could have his way, "they'd probably be meshed fairly completely, because my responsibility is for both . . . ."

Some of the "catches" in the situation had been discussed by the policy board, probably more by the executive committee, Rinderer admitted.

As the MCTC proceeds, the policy boards in the three counties will need more discussion on how there can coexist within one center, programs that address teachers' needs primarily and professional development activities that assist schools with improvement. School improvement could more easily coexist with teacher-centered inservice education if teacher involvement were fundamental in the school-improvement process. But there are inevitably times and places where people mandate inservice requirements and tasks.

The MCTC, now actually three county teacher centers, has the opportunity to explore this new ground and can be helpful to many other centers across the country that are also wrestling with this problem.

An appropriate closing thought came from a teacher at Edwardsville who said, "It doesn't really matter what we call the center; what matters is that we maintain the basic premises of a teacher center."

With its western boundary at the Mississippi River and its eastern parts reaching into Illinois's interior, Madison County is home to a wide range of economic activity and socioeconomic groups. It is very much a suburb of St. Louis, but it also has its own heavy industry (e.g., steel mills) and supports agriculture as well. Adjoining Macoupin and Randolph-Monroe Counties, now part of the service area of the Madison County Teacher Center, are much more rural than Madison County. Most livelihoods in these areas are linked to agriculture and coal mining.

The Madison County school districts served by the Madison County Teacher Center reflect the varying concentrations of people. The county's largest system enrolls about 9,000 students, its smallest, about 216. Macoupin and Randolph-Monroe Counties, by contrast, are made up of fairly small school districts, the largest numbering no more than 1,000 students.

This chapter is based on a site visit to Edwardsville, Illinois, on June 15-16, 1982. Persons who were interviewed and provided assistance in gathering data were Ray Althoff, sixth grade teacher, LeClaire Elementary School, Edwardsville, and former director, Madison County Teacher Center; Don Baden, director, Madison County Teacher Center, and associate dean, School of Education, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville; Shirley Bellm, special education teacher, Highland Community Schools; Gene Briggs, regional superintendent, Madison County; Joseph Gore, dean, School of Education, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville; Margaret Leyda, media specialist, Triad High School, Troy, and former policy board member, Madison County Teacher Center; Russ Masinelli, regional superintendent, Macoupin County; Dennis Pluta, art specialist, Maryville West Elementary School, and former inservice coordinator, Madison County Teacher Center; Ann Rauh, kindergarten teacher, Lincoln Elementary School, Collinsville, and former policy board chairperson, Madison County Teacher Center; Arnette Rauschel, educational consultant, Illinois State Board of Education; Sharon Rinderer, English teacher, Highland Junior High School, and policy board chairperson, Madison County Teacher Center; and Mary Lou Sickbert, kindergarten teacher, LeClaire Elementary School, Edwardsville, and policy board member, Madison County Teacher Center.

Taking a Teacher Center to a School: Pittsburgh Area Center for Teachers, Carnegie-Mellon University

Reizenstein, in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, is an unusual school: A middle school, its 1,500 students are divided into three houses, each house including sixth, seventh, and eighth grades. Eleven interdisciplinary teams of five teachers teach approximately 150 students each in core areas such as reading, language arts, science, math, and social studies. For occupational, vocational, and technical (OVT) subjects such as home economics, business, and industrial arts, and for music and art, there is another team of teachers. Only the core-subject teachers have homerooms.

Leadership and coordination are the responsibility of team leaders for each team, department heads in each subject area, deans heading each house, and a principal for the whole school. There is also an in-house supervisor and instructional specialist who works with both teachers and students as a sort of nonadministrative curriculum-instruction coordinator and student personnel worker.

Reizenstein is not a magnet school, but it draws students from various types of neighborhoods from virtually all over town. The student population is primarily Black, but "multiethnic" is probably a better description, for Oriental, Hispanic, Near Eastern, and white students are well represented.

Into this school one fall day in 1981 walked Teacher Associates Ann Marie Lenhardt and Theresa Woodruff from the Pittsburgh Area Center for Teachers (PACT). That initial visit, intended to let Reizenstein faculty know about the resources at PACT, grew into a building project in which the two teacher associates, with backup from other PACT staff, helped teachers with a variety of instructional and curriculum needs. Lenhardt and Woodruff spent one day a week at Reizenstein listening and responding to teachers.

Saul Diamond, a team leader and a social studies teacher in House C, served as the entry point. He had heard about PACT but had never made use of its services. His first request was for help with a "scholars class." Of the 140 or so students whom Diamond's team served, 28 took all of their core subjects at an advanced level. Diamond wanted to assign each scholar an American colony to follow from colonial days to the present. Lenhardt and Woodruff relayed his call for help back to another PACT teacher associate, Bonnie McCarthy, who suggested an entire unit for the assignment.

"Bonnie really did a thorough job," Diamond reported. "She gave me all kinds of suggestions, source material, descriptions of what I could do, games, assignments I might give, oral reports I might assign, and types of tests to use." He appeared pleasantly surprised at the detail of the response PACT had made, and continued,

> I really didn't give her that much information--merely what I had in mind and what I was doing, that I'd gotten myself started and

> wasn't sure of the direction I wanted to take. She took a few notes and got me what I needed. The students are all following different states now, and the thing is under way.

The help that was provided to Diamond and other teachers got shared. Diamond told of monthly meetings of social studies teachers in which "we've discussed PACT materials. The services of PACT have also spread as one teacher tells another of help received." Three of five members of Diamond's team were now using PACT services.

Asked if PACT was making any difference with students, Diamond replied,

> If I hadn't had help from the center on this project, I would have floundered and the students would have noticed . . . . They've helped me motivate my students. If I can get people to do that, then I think all their efforts are worthwhile. If I feel students are getting something out of what they're doing and at the end of the year they can come back and say (or their parents can say) to me that they've had a good year--that's what's important to me, and I think PACT is contributing this year for me to do that.

"How do graduate courses compare with PACT inservice activities?" I asked Diamond and got an immediate negative reply. "Graduate courses don't turn me on at all," he said.

> They aren't teacher oriented. When something isn't teacher oriented and teachers aren't involved in preparing the course, there are real difficulties in making things relevant, but when you're dealing one-to-one with teachers--and you're dealing with peers--you're a lot better off in the long run. You bring a PACT person [to help] or you bring another teacher--they are aware of what happens in the classroom, and I think they can relate more to the teacher . . . .

It had not all been as easy as Diamond's remarks suggested. For one thing, getting to know Reizenstein faculty and finding time to talk with them was a difficult problem for Lenhardt and Woodruff. "We don't have any paid [inservice] time for teachers. We only have planning time three times a week," said Ruth Leff, the in-house supervisor and instructional specialist. "So we've had to coordinate their time [Lenhardt's and Woodruff's] with our time. But we've found them to be very cooperative. We've found out that they're there when we need them."

Despite limits on time, a large school, and many faculty members, the PACT teacher associates gradually increased the number of faculty with whom they had contact. One way they did that was through workshops. Leff gave an example:

> From talking with Theresa and Ann Marie we found out that they did activities on time and stress, which are factors in teacher

> burnout. So they arranged to do workshops with social studies and OVT teachers in those areas--a paperload workshop and a stress workshop.

I sensed strong support from Leff and obviously great involvement, which surprised me because she seemed to be part of the school administration and I had heard one teacher talk about being assigned to go to a workshop. So I asked Leff whether there was any conflict between what she as an administrator wanted and what teachers wanted.

> "I'm not really administration," Leff replied.
>
> I supervise but I don't rate teachers. I'm kind of their resource. I don't evaluate teachers. The principal and the deans are evaluators. I observe teachers and get a sense of what their needs are--and most of the time what I perceive is what they themselves think they need.
>
> In terms of a PACT workshop, such as the stress workshop, if there was something else a teacher had to attend to on that day, or if someone didn't want to go, or would hate to go, there's no pressure. These PACT activities aren't mandatory. I gave it [the announcement about the stress workshop] to everyone in OVT. It was an open thing. If a teacher had some particular reason she couldn't attend, then she was permitted not to come.

More about how PACT approached teachers came out in an interview with Kathy Trichtinger and Marcia Ekunfeo, two of three art teachers who were associated with Houses A and B. Trichtinger explained how she had met Lenhardt and Woodruff: "We were cleaning up our painting from our 8' x 20' banner, and they came in to chat. 'Now is not the time!' I thought then. But they got a feel for what we do in my room, right away."

"We got a chance to see how good she was with the kids, too," said Woodruff.

That had also been Ekunfeo's first contact with Lenhardt and Woodruff, for she had happened in to Trichtinger's room soon after their arrival. She recalled,

> They offered their services, any way that they could give help with curriculum. That was when?--the Cleveland Browns-Steelers game--November 1981. They gave us their cards and where they were available over at Carnegie-Mellon, and what they were up to. They wanted to make sure we were getting their mailings. That was our introduction. After that they'd stop in now and then and see how things were going--just like an interested party who visits. We also had an inservice with them [along with] the special ed and language arts teachers, two mornings

> a week for two weeks. It dealt with managing your time and setting priorities, looking at your personal goals and your career goals, and how you should focus on your priorities and let some other things go by the wayside.

"Did you go to that voluntarily?" I asked.

"Well, I was one of the people who were scheduled to be there," said Trichtinger.

> If I'm scheduled, I go. Someone has gone to the trouble of putting together a workshop, right? And I'm supposed to be there, so I go. There's always something new you can pick up, or something that you are reminded about, something you hadn't thought about or made a list of. I'm always one to make a list. In fact, I make a list of my menu whenever I have company over for dinner. I post it on my stove, and that way I don't forget the cranberry sauce. So that's what that inservice did . . . : coping with stress--just making lists, finding out where your priorities are, and using your time so that you can avoid stress and focus on the things that are important to you. That was the gist of the workshop.

The previous fall Ekunfeo had gone to one of PACT's workshops with art teachers from all over Allegheny County. She reported,

> That was delightful. We looked at the things that art teachers run into, such as parents who just don't care [about art]. There was also sharing--some of the motivational things that other teachers do . . . , the types of work they do. It was reassuring looking at ideas that had been successful for someone else. There were things that I might try, methods I might adapt. Of course, everything is not going to work. I can't teach the way someone else teaches . . .--my personality's different. But I can adapt the materials and ideas to the way I teach, to the way kids receive me.

The sparkle in Ekunfeo's eyes and the animation in her voice prompted me to ask what the workshop had done for her morale. She replied,

> I came back [from the workshop] with a little more spunkiness. You know--you get a little tired at times with people saying, "I don't care about art; my mama doesn't care about the grade." I came back feeling I have something to teach. You may never be a Michaelangelo, but you'll see as long as you live. Utilizing your eyes and your brain creatively will get you anywhere you want to go. You can catch any dolt on the street to get the average thinker's opinion . . . You have to really reach to come up with an idea. Those are the people [whom]

> people pay for their thoughts because they've learned to go beyond Joe Doaks--to see, to look, to turn their brain off and let their eyes educate their brain.

Had she gotten all that from the workshop? I asked.

"No," she said, "that was my focus and the workshop revived and reinforced it. It gave me an upper. I came back spunky."

There was also evidence of PACT assistance at the school library. Betty Brewer, the librarian, reported having worked with three teachers from one team (Bill Werner, Linda Rieser, and Betty Quails), with PACT support, on helping eighth graders use the library for research. "These kids learned to know their way around the library better than other kids," Brewer said, ". . . and that keeps me from having to run from the desk or what I'm doing. They know what they're looking for and have an idea of how to find it."

Georgia Vassilakis, the dean of House B, shared still another example of PACT assistance. In my experience, she said,

> so many teachers were reluctant to strut their stuff when I asked them to share. The answer was too often, no, they didn't want to do it. So when we set up this inservice session, I was afraid that teachers would sit there and react pretty much like they had in the past. But it didn't go that way. Carole Popchock [program coordinator of PACT], who conducted the workshop, had a couple of activities--games and role playing--that everybody had to do. She got them to indicate their area of expertise and what things they knew or cared to do in addition to classroom knowledge. We jotted down some nonschool things--I did myself--like real estate, fund raising, chess. There were some really interesting things about the teachers that I hadn't known before.

Afterwards Ruth Leff had said to Vassilakis, "Why don't you compile the information that you have and put it out?" This had been new territory for Vassilakis, and she admitted having wondered whether she should ask teachers if they would like to share this information. "No, I decided, I'm not going to ask," she said.

> It wasn't confidential stuff. There wasn't anything on the list that people shouldn't know. So we compiled it. When it went out, there was buzzing for days. In the lunchroom I happened to hear conversations, people saying, "I didn't know you were into remodeling!" or "I didn't know you did such-and-such."

The result was that some teachers asked other teachers to come into their class and share experiences and expertise. Both the teachers and the students enjoyed that, according to Vassilakis. It was "the first real

crossing over the barrier of going into another teacher's classroom and sharing."

"We need some follow-up," Vassilakis went on,

> to continue the enthusiasm generated and the getting over the fear of talking about yourself . . . We have a resource of some 200 adults in this building. We don't have to reach out to find expertise in a lot of areas. Just in House B alone, we have great talents. If we could reach across the school, the resources would really be broad and rich . . . We just need the wherewithal to get all this coordinated so that teachers can get what they want. PACT is an important source of ideas and resources to that end.

The PACT approach at Reizenstein was informal. The direction seemed to come out of teachers', deans', and the in-house supervisor's needs rather than any preconceived plan. The results seemed consistently positive. Teachers were getting to know each other better. There was more communication and sharing. Some teachers were using other teachers in their classes when they had learned of special expertise or experience. More resources were getting to teachers, as were suggestions for ways of handling procedures and content. Rapport between teachers and the in-house supervisor--good to start with--seemed to have been enhanced. In observing the approach of PACT at Reizenstein, I was prompted to wonder whether more inservice education/professional development should be of a responsive sort, as opposed to preplanned programs with precise specified outcomes.

I talked with Pat Lawyer, a team leader in the OVT group, Rita Mamula, a business teacher, and Margaret Ann McKibben, a speech-language pathologist. McKibben had attended the already mentioned stress-management workshop and had found it extremely helpful. Mamula was impressed with the help PACT had provided for a teacher-planned career day (for students), which had brought in speakers from various occupations--everything from hairdressers to lawyers to cosmetologists to business executives--who introduced the students to business and the working world. They did more than talk. For example, said Woodruff, "the hairdresser cut my hair, showing the kids how it was done."

Lawyer chimed in,

> Afterwards I got one woman in cosmetology to come back and work with my class, and had nothing but excellent responses. I then arranged it for all eighth graders and had three additional people come in. Kids could arrange for a facial, a haircut, and other direct experiences. It gave kids a sense of what the real world is all about. It wasn't a matter of my just standing there and talking to them.

Another teacher making use of PACT services at Reizenstein was

Charlotte Fong. Fong taught seventh grade reading to a wide range of students--in her words, "from first grade reading level to the very intellectual." Said Fong,

> PACT has helped me out by finding extra materials to deal better with reading comprehension and vocabulary development. I asked for materials that would make students think. I wanted materials that would help kids pick up skills not necessarily using a basal reader. What I like most is that I can give Theresa a topic and she can find materials for me. That makes it easier for me. Time, you know, is not always on my side.
>
> I've become more creative as a result. I've gotten away from sole reliance on the basal reader . . . Different aspects of reading have been brought to my attention . . . I've learned to use time a little bit better.

Fong's team leader Ken Sutton joined us while Fong was reporting. He also gave testimony on help from PACT: He had talked with Woodruff about what he wanted to do with myths in his language arts classes, PACT staff had done the legwork, and in a week or so Woodruff had returned with supplementary materials.

Larry Lasky, another member of Sutton's team, had learned only recently about the services of PACT from Fong and Sutton. He was beginning to request assistance. He said,

> In the mainstream [of teaching] you just don't have time enough. I seldom get out of here before 4:30, quarter to five. To think about driving to Banksville or down to Northside, fighting the city traffic, and heading all the way out to the eastern suburbs where I live--there's just no way. This, to me, is a fantastic service. I've now had one experience with PACT, a positive one, and I'll be using it again.

Woodruff was the only PACT staff member who accompanied me to Reizenstein (and she was with me only part of the time), so other PACT staff members did not hear the reports from teachers, team leaders, deans, or the in-house supervisor. Back at PACT, in a conversation with Lenhardt, McCarthy, Popchock, and Roberta Leach, I thought it appropriate to get their perceptions of what had happened at Reizenstein. Popchock spoke first:

> At Reizenstein we've demonstrated something that we've promised teachers all along: You don't have to come to the center; the center can come to you. It has come to Reizenstein in the form of materials that we've delivered there from our curriculum library for them to examine, for them to use if appropriate. It has come to them in the form of very specific service on very specific requests, for example, assistance in designing

> activities for a history club or revamping the colonial unit in the social studies. It has come to them in the form of two staff members who have been on the site frequently, and who have been available for teachers to talk to and to ask questions of and to get ideas from about other community resources that are accessible to teachers. It's culminated in programs that started off as individual requests for service but when many individuals required similar services and purposes, we designed workshops and things to meet those requests. As a result the teachers at Reizenstein have never had to leave their own houses. They have had all the benefits of the teacher center and a lot of hours of service devoted to just their faculty.

Another result, added Leach, is that "many teachers and probably supervisors have come to accept the teacher center as a nonthreatening vehicle through which to direct their own requests and need for change."

"Feedback in oral and written form tells us that what we've sent them is what they asked for," McCarthy remarked. She cited Diamond and the unit on colonial history as an example:

> He was really pleased. He was ready to implement some of those ideas into the curriculum right then and there. He did that, and it made for a more exciting, dynamic, larger-scope unit for his students. And I suspect change in teacher behavior might have had an effect on student behavior, but I can't go as far as to say that because I don't have the data to make that strong a statement.

Popchock pointed out that PACT had also encouraged Reizenstein teachers to look at themselves as resources, to recognize that among them were talents they had never tapped before. Answers don't always come from an expertly written textbook or a college course, PACT staff had suggested; they can come from loosely structured interaction among colleagues. Said Popchock,

> I think we've given them some processes for getting assistance from one another in a nonthreatening way, helping them recognize that often we look at our own problems from a very narrow perspective, but when we explain them to someone else, all kinds of avenues open up that we never saw there before.

Lenhardt observed that because PACT was so readily available to Leff, the in-house supervisor, and because Leff had supported PACT from the beginning and had made it available to teachers, "they probably experienced a lot more staff development than they would have without us."

Asked how deliberately PACT staff had planned their approach to Reizenstein, Popchock responded, "We didn't--it evolved." In all the

schools we visit, she explained, we've tried to establish the kind of continuing relationship with many teachers that we've achieved at Reizenstein. "We are frequently in schools asking teachers, 'What can I do for you? Do you need any materials or anything?'" Reizenstein is simply "the first place where it took off so well . . . . , involving more teachers than just the occasional one or two that might pass through the faculty room."

"I think it happened when Ann Marie and Theresa went there to just find out about the school," McCarthy noted. They had met Leff, who had tried to identify what she thought might be of practical use to her faculty.

> She kept inviting them to come back, and she made it convenient for them to see people systematically, not just randomly. She made it possible for teachers to be free to talk to them and tell them what they needed. Ann Marie and Theresa then could come back to the staff and say this is what came up this week, and we could work on it, and they could take it back. So I think the supervisor definitely played a key role in helping to make this a more formal thing.

PACT's policy board and staff were very deliberate in selecting teacher associates who had a certain style, according to Popchock. In their first few weeks new staff members were oriented to the teacher center philosophy and operating principles. Explained Popchock,

> We emphasize the notion that we do not portray ourselves as experts; we portray ourselves as the colleagues of these people. We're there to serve as a vehicle to help them solve their own problems and help them tap into resources they might not know. There is a definite intent on the part of the personnel committee of the policy board when interviewing candidates to be sure to find people who are comfortable in situations where they are meeting strangers.

One of the interesting aspects of this program was the relationship between Leff and teachers. For example, teachers were scheduled to attend some workshops, but Leff said they did not have to go if they did not feel a need. Some teachers apparently knew that and behaved accordingly. Even the teachers who did not know that did not resent Leff for assigning them to go to a workshop, nor did they seem to resent the workshops.

The organization of the school and the staff into houses and cross-disciplinary teams within houses could have contributed to a group of teachers' knowing a group of 140-150 students well and perhaps to their finding ways to help students integrate different subjects. That happened at Reizenstein but apparently not until the PACT people began working with teachers. Before PACT's involvement, teachers had thought of themselves as individual professionals working with a group in their own

area, and they had not had much interchange with other teachers. What PACT caused was sharing. For example, both Sutton, the seventh grade language arts teacher, and Fong, the seventh grade reading teacher, wanted supplementary reading material, part of it myths and fables. They began to see that their areas overlapped, and they also recognized different reasons for dealing with the same material.

The people in the existing system could not do what PACT was doing. "The supervisors can't always gather the outside resources on as short a notice as PACT can," explained Leff. "As a supervisor, I must spend much of my time on direct academic services for the improvement of instruction using the building's existing supplementary materials."

Lyn Margolis, the chairperson of the PACT policy board, had an official board view of the work at Reizenstein: "We've been kept informed on the Reizenstein project regularly. We know what's going on, but we leave the operation of the program to the staff."

Margolis also had a personal view from her acquaintance with many of the teachers at Reizenstein:

> I've known some of the teachers [PACT is working with at Reizenstein] for a number of years, and I always ask them, "How are things?" For years I have been getting woe-is-me stories, teachers telling me, "Oh, I wish the year could be over--it's so hard . . . . " Interestingly, this year the same question is asked and [the answers are], "Things are so super this year." I get no more woe-is-me stories from these same teachers. Their attitude has changed 180 degrees. There is no other change in that building except the work of PACT. There's really no change in their supervision, in the kinds of kids they have; there's no real realignment of the class; there's been no major change in their administration. Things are now super.

The service role that PACT fashioned at Reizenstein in just one year helped teachers in all subjects and at all three grade levels. The circle of the service widened as teachers told one another about morale boosters, content support, material resources, and teaching ideas, or as they talked with an informed, experienced professional. Lenhardt and Woodruff skillfully provided nurture, a neutral ground for teachers, and a link to the rich resources and know-how of PACT staff. Taking the teacher center to the school began to influence the community that Reizenstein school was. Acceptance by and acclaim from both teachers and administrators made the project an appealing model of third-party service to a school.

Pittsburgh is situated in southwestern Pennsylvania, at the point where the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers join to form the Ohio. About 2.2 million people live in the city and its suburbs. Heavily industrialized because of its location on three navigable rivers and its easy access to coal and iron ore, Pittsburgh is home to many iron and steel mills and glass works.

The Pittsburgh Area Center for Teachers started in 1979 with a federal grant to Carnegie-Mellon University. The center serves primarily middle and high school teachers in over 30 of the 42 school districts that make up Allegheny County (of which Pittsburgh is the seat).

This chapter is based on a site visit to Pittsburgh on April 7, 1982. Persons who were interviewed and provided assistance in gathering data were Betty Brewer, librarian, Reizenstein Middle School; Saul Diamond, eighth grade social studies teacher and team leader in House C, Reizenstein Middle School; Marcia Ekunfeo, art teacher in Houses A and B, Reizenstein Middle School; Ted Fenton, assistant director, Education Center, Carnegie-Mellon University; Charlotte Fong, seventh grade reading teacher in House C, Reizenstein Middle School; Larry Lasky, seventh grade science teacher in House C, Reizenstein Middle School; Pat Lawyer, occupational/vocational/technical teacher and team leader, Reizenstein Middle School; Roberta Leach, teacher associate, PACT; Ruth Leff, in-house supervisor and instructional specialist, Reizenstein Middle School; Ann Marie Lenhardt, teacher associate, PACT; Rita Mamula, business teacher, Reizenstein Middle School; Lyn Margolis, social studies teacher, Schenley High School, and policy board chairperson, PACT: Bonnie McCarthy, teacher associate, PACT; Margaret Ann McKibben, speech-language pathologist, Reizenstein Middle School; Carole Popchock, program coordinator, PACT; Ken Sutton, seventh grade language arts teacher and team leader in House C, Reizenstein Middle School; Kathy Trichtinger, art teacher in Houses A and B, Reizenstein Middle School; Georgia Vassilakis, dean of House B, Reizenstein Middle School; Malcolm Woodall, director, PACT; and Theresa Woodruff, teacher associate, PACT.

Improving High School Teaching:
San Fernando Valley Teacher Center, California State University at Northridge

Jean Chamberlain, music teacher, 36 years experience
Dorothy Liles, foreign language teacher, 35 years experience
Frank Beal, math teacher, 27 years experience
Norman Nero, foreign language teacher, 21 years experience
Aurora Stickels, social studies teacher, 20 years experience
John Holodnik, English teacher, 18 years experience
Liba Feuerstein, English teacher, 17 years experience
Ronnie Alperin, English teacher, 15 years experience

These eight people are all faculty members at Granada Hills High School[1] (GHHS) in Los Angeles, California. In years of experience they are not atypical of GHHS faculty members. They reflect a nationwide trend toward more stable and thus more experienced school faculties. They are part of what some educators see as a problem: They cannot be enticed into inservice education programs by the old carrots of more money, more credits, more degrees, because they have the highest degree they need and are at the top of the salary schedule.

These eight are also part of the solution: They believe that they still need to grow professionally, and they have acted on that belief in a particularly intensive way. They and 16 other GHHS faculty members have participated in a semester-long daily workshop on effective teaching.

And they have given the workshop five-star ratings! Consider these comments from those of the eight who are graduates:

> Alperin (class number two): It's like a refresher in many respects for some of us, a reawakening and a new awareness of what we've already been doing . . . It would probably be highly instrumental in helping a new teacher . . . .
>
> Holodnik (class number one): It is the kind of program that I think makes the most sense. It's something that needs to be done because the clientele of schools differs. For example, in our district we have a lot of busing that's not mandatory but still brings us students that we've not had a lot of experience with before. So there needs to be some kind of ongoing thing . . . .
>
> Nero (class number one): It was one of the most practical and most beneficial inservice experiences I've had. This one

---

[1] "Granada" is pronounced "Grah 'nah dah." Said Liles, "It means 'pomegranate' in Spanish."

Margo Johnson coauthored this chapter.

> seemed to take the ball from where we were and run with it rather than start from the goal and say this was where we were going.
>
> Chamberlain (class number two): This was really the nuts and bolts. It was something you could go into the classroom and use right then. I never thought of it as theory, and that was neat.
>
> Beal (class number two): I thought the workshop was so great because I met people in there I didn't even know. People'd come up to me and say, "You a new teacher here?" I'd say, "No, I started here in 1961."
>
> Stickels (class number two): The most important thing that happened was that we were aware of what's happening in the school, [in] the other classrooms. We know what's happening in our classroom, we know what's happening in our department, but many times we're completely unaware of what's going on in other departments.

Let us take a closer look at what all the accolades are about.

Back in 1978 GHHS received a three-year grant under California's School Improvement Program (SIP). Among the possible uses of the money was staff development. Martin Kaufman, who became the school's SIP coordinator, tried several approaches to staff development--bringing VIPs to campus, sending teachers to off-campus seminars, holding after-school workshops, etc.--with few enduring effects and some not-so-good responses.

"Teachers said, 'It was much too short--we need more,'" related Kaufman. Or they begrudged the release time to go to a seminar because it meant a substitute and a substitute usually meant more, not less work. Or they would simply not put in the time after school.

Kaufman persisted. He sought out Bernice Medinnis, the director of the San Fernando Valley Teacher Center (a project of California State University, Northridge), for her ideas on what to do. Medinnis and Janine Roberts, the teacher center's program coordinator, had been working with Kaufman on other aspects of the local program. Said Kaufman of the teacher center's work,

> I was very impressed with the fact that it was putting its focus on the individual teacher--not on what was better for the school . . . , but on what individual teachers needed to make their job more satisfying and consequently more productive for the students.

Kaufman and Medinnis put their heads together. What kind of program would teachers respond to? they asked themselves. They identified three important ingredients. First, Kaufman said,

> teachers needed to be updated on what is happening in educational research, from the standpoint of successful practices from teachers around the country.
>
> Secondly, teachers needed to have a chance to participate in a workshop where they could try these things out. If they liked them, they could use them; if they didn't like them, they could drop them.

Third, concluded Kaufman and Medinnis, teachers would like a reduction in load.

Their idea: a one-semester, repeating workshop on proven strategies of effective teaching, running one period a day, five days a week, jointly sponsored by the high school and the teacher center. Participating teachers would have their class load reduced from five to four preparations. Strategies would be formally presented one day a week, tried out in the classroom and discussed in the workshop the other days of the week.

Kaufman talked the idea around with the SIP site council and GHHS staff. Two major objections were voiced, he said. "The parents [on the site council] did not like the idea of having just anybody cover the [participating teacher's] class, . . . and the staff in the departments wanted to make sure that they were not underwriting the program." So it was agreed that the program would seek a volunteer from each participating teacher's department to take that teacher's fifth class, <u>for extra pay</u>.

The decision to reduce each teacher's load by one class was significant for Holodnik. The workshop was, he said,

> the only time in my career that I've had anybody consider me worthy of investing in. In other words, they gave me a period to improve my instruction. Always in the past it would come at your own expense. You'd have to go in on Saturday, [or] you'd have to stay after school. It was always a kind of punitive arrangement.

The issue of covering participants' classes settled, another problem arose: The SIP site council, which by law controlled the high school's SIP funds, said they would support the workshop only if they could identify the teachers who needed the training--"the weak teachers," said Kaufman. After unsuccessfully trying to talk them out of this position, Kaufman called Medinnis in. Said Medinnis, "I told them, 'Okay, fine, but you'll have to get someone else to do the workshop. Our policy board only allows us to work with teachers who volunteer to come in, simply because research shows they're the only ones who are going to take advantage of [what they learn] anyway.'" Kaufman then added, "Since our goal is to have all teachers on the staff eventually volunteer to participate in the program, we do not want the stigma of remediation to be associated in anyone's mind with the content of the workshop." The SIP site council gave in. So

participation was voluntary.

The format, said Kaufman, was that Medinnis or Roberts came one day a week, on Wednesday, and made a presentation. He followed up on Thursday.

> We review what they did the previous day, see if there were any questions, any clarifications called for. In the meantime, I'm in touch with Bernice to find out where she left off, what she'd like me to do next, and I feed her the group's reactions to the presentation on Wednesday.
>
> At the end of Thursday what we say is, "All right, now here's a chance for you to start practicing some of this particular technique in your classroom. Friday we would like to hear from you to find out what's gone on: What reactions did you have? What failures? What questions?"

On Friday, Monday, and Tuesday, then, teachers tried out the technique in their classroom and talked about their try-outs in the workshop. Holodnik told us that he had especially liked this "built-in model of self-correction. There always seemed to be a kind of recycling system built in [whereby you'd say], 'Well, if that didn't work, what else is there that can be done?' You constantly readjusted and reguided yourself."

The topics of instruction ranged across the research on effective teaching, from studies of the right and the left brain to Bloom's taxonomy. The Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study provided the general framework for the workshop, explained Medinnis.

> Teachers will buy that study; they understand it immediately. But they don't understand the sophistication and the complexity of it. We start out with the first finding of that study, which says that the amount of time a teacher allocates to instruction has a direct effect on the achievement of students. And all the teachers laugh: "You mean it cost millions to find that out?"
>
> But when we start tearing that apart and getting at it, we realize the fantastic effect that time has . . . It's something that most teachers have not analyzed. That is, they are not aware of the amount of time they spend on actual instruction as distinguished from the time they spend on discipline, class business, and interruptions.

Another aspect of time which the workshop dealt with was "wait time," a component of effective teaching thoroughly researched by Mary Budd Rowe of the University of Florida. Kaufman explained it this way:

> Teachers are very prone to ask a question and then not allow

the student enough time to filter the question, think about it, mull it over, and start formulating a response. We say, "Are you aware that the time teachers wait has been figured at a little less than one second from the time the teacher asks the question till he's ready to move to another student?" They say, "No, that's not true,"

Then we try some gimmicks with them in the session, and we pause in the middle of a sentence for four or five seconds, and their eyes get big and watch us, and they say, "What are you doing? What are you doing?" And we tell them, "This is what three, four, five seconds are like." They're shocked by that.

They practice wait time with other workshop participants using some mock lessons. Then they try it in their classroom--developed and elaborated, of course--and they say, "It does work!" You get far fewer people blurting out. You also have students that you'd pretty much pegged as being mediocre suddenly coming up with some intriguing answers. They've even explained the research to their students, and the students seem to feel better about the process: They feel they are not being rushed--that everyone is getting a chance.

Beal, the math teacher, described wait time from his perspective:

You say something [to a student] and it hasn't even soaked in yet, and boom! you give him something else. The kid hasn't had a chance to think. I watch myself all the time now. I ask a question and then I just stand there, and I can see the wheels beginning to turn--the kids are thinking.

Me--sure I know the subject . . . But the kid--it's the first time he's ever heard of it. And one of the things about geometry . . . it's really a course in logic, and this is very difficult for them.

Another subject that many teachers found relevant and useful was learning modalities. In the opening session on this subject, Roberts shared research indicating that people learn differently from different modes of sensory input, and she presented--she modeled--techniques for combining auditory, visual, and kinesthetic modes rather than relying on one mode almost exclusively (usually the auditory one). Stickels told us how she had applied the techniques to a lesson on World War I and Woodrow Wilson: "We read it in the book, things were put on the board [by the students], I showed a filmstrip, we discussed it, then I showed a movie--all on the same subject!"

"Some of them still didn't know what I was talking about," she added

sadly.

"The kinesthetic learners, right?" Roberts quipped.

Roberts used a kit to help illustrate her points about learning modalities. With it each teacher could determine his or her own preferred modes of learning. Said Kaufman,

> Janine leads the people on beautifully by letting them all assume that they are auditory learners. And then we go through the test . . . I would have bet pretty much everything that I owned that I was an auditory learner, and I think that was the focus on which I tended to teach my class primarily, although I think I brought in some of the other modalities. But when I took the test and I got to the auditory portion, I got so upset, I said, "Stop it! I'm not doing anymore! I've had enough!"
>
> After I simmered down some minutes later, we all sat and talked about it, and it occurred to us that that's what our kids are going through in the classroom. When you're using an auditory approach on a visual learner, he's going to suffer frustration. Many adults wouldn't tolerate it--they'd get up and walk out. And our kids can't. So if they're acting up, there may be justification for it.
>
> Since each learner functions best if the material can be presented to his preferred modality, the effective teacher will attempt to present new material in all three modalities so that students can encounter it with a minimum of frustrations.

"Everybody said [to me], 'You have to be an auditory learner, being a musician,'" recalled Chamberlain, the music teacher. "And I said, 'I doubt it--I have a hunch I'm visual.' And the results of the kit exercise indicated that I was strongly visual."

Several of the teachers had used the learning-modalities kit with their students. Beal reported, "I think it was a good experience because they're still using it . . . The kids still say, 'I'm a visual--you'll have to write it down.'"

"So they've learned something about learning," we said. Nodding, Beal quickly added, "They've learned something about other kids too."

Of her experience using the kit with her students, Chamberlain said,

> There was one girl who was strongly kinesthetic, and she immediately began to improve when I would have her go to the board and actually do it rather than explain it to me or hear it . . . She has improved tremendously since knowing that she

is strongly kinesthetic.

Chamberlain's use of what she had learned about modalities had gone beyond just sharing the kit with her students. "I have tried to apply all three [modalities] so I'm bound to catch them on one. It's made quite a difference for quite a few of the kids," she said.

Foreign language teacher Liles, a member of class number three, was also impressed with the notion of learning modalities. To make the point with her third-year Spanish class and also to help them learn Spanish better through the neglected kinesthetic mode, she and her class had prepared a skit and videotaped it. The skit had been about a person hosting a dinner at a Mexican restaurant. Recalled Liles, "It involved the waiter setting the table, moving the apparatus around, talking about the guests arriving; the guests sitting down, eating, spilling water, saying goodbye to the hostess." Talk and touch were related by, for example, the waiter's saying what he was doing as he did it: "I put the fork here, the knife here, etc." Liles continued, "So it was an introduction to explain how language can be learned by hearing and seeing, but until you actually use it and act it out, it's not really learned."

In relation to this skit Liles noted a particularly intriguing phenomenon:

> What surprised me was the way the things that the teachers were learning in the workshop were getting around among students . . . When I was ready to do the videotape, the director of SIP said that I should introduce it with a talk about what kinesthetic learning is. So I hurriedly wrote something out--it was the night before we were to tape it--and [the next morning] a boy said, "You told me I could do that," and I said, "Oh! All right, Craig, I'd forgotten, but what are you doing to say?" and I started to hand him the paper [I'd written], and he said, "Oh, I have it here." And he not only had a big speech about what kinesthetic learning was, but he recited it beautifully. And he had really a better understanding of it than I did because he compared elementary school learning to high school learning.

Apparently one of the student's teachers the previous semester had been a member of the SIP workshop and had talked to the students at some length about learning modalities.

Nero, Liles's colleague in the foreign language department, found that modality teaching helped "the so-called slower learners"--"students . . . who are probably taking a [foreign language] for just a minimum requirement--they'll never do anything about it or go on with it." He said he helped them "the way the elementary school teacher would do it"--having them make the sounds and "trace" the letters. He explained,

It's not really tracing . . . I have a big chart that I made of

> the vowel sounds, concentrating on [the fact that] these are not English letters anymore; these are French letters now or Spanish letters now, and when you write this first vowel, it is in Spanish an "ah," and as they spell out words on the board, we pronounce the vowels and the words.

English teacher Feuerstein, another member of class number three, said the unit on learning modalities had validated some of what she was already doing and made her more aware of it. For example, she said her students held a Renaissance Fair every year, and she now had a different view of it--as a kinesthetic learning experience.

Both Feuerstein and Holodnik observed that the possibilities for kinesthetic learning in English literature were limited. Holodnik said that the notion of modality teaching served him in a different way:

> If I'm explaining some point of grammar, I try to think of some remote analogy so that the kid who knows nothing about grammar but knows something about cars, say, would get it. I don't know that I did that before, but I have in the back of my mind now the notion of modalities. It's not [really] modalities; it's just that these kids come to us with such different experiences and you need to [reach for] any conceivable analogy to help them understand.

Another workshop unit was on classroom management, in particular, a set of strategies developed into a training program by California consultant Frederic Jones. One of the program's techniques for dealing with disruptive behavior was "moving in." Without saying anything the teacher would simply move across the room toward the disruptive student. This intrusion into the student's physical space would be threatening enough that the student would alter his or her behavior so as to regain privacy. Chamberlain, admitting that she tended "to yell first and think later," described the moving-in technique and talked about how effective it had been for her:

> When you have a kid that's disturbing the class, you turn around, you face him, you pause, you take a couple of deep breaths--which I often did not do. I've taught so long--36 years--and [this technique of moving in is] something that I'm sure I'd heard, but it was really brought home to me [in the workshop].
>
> I used it with a kid just yesterday, and it works. I did not have to get clear over to the kid . . . The look on the kid's face was priceless . . . --the way his face changed: "I'm working! I'm working!"

Lesson-plan format also got attention in the workshop. As part of this unit Medinnis gave the teachers a checklist of the vital components

common to all the different approaches to lesson planning--such components as identification of long-range goals, development of tentative time-task calendars, use of pretest and posttest data, techniques for reducing resistance to learning, ways to assess students' level of understanding, and short- and long-term evaluation of the entire process. "It's more complex getting 30 kids to take off than it is to take off a 747, and no pilot takes off a 747 without a checklist," said Medinnis.

This unit had had a particularly strong effect on Holodnik. He reported,

> I'm always very conscious [now] of starting the period out with what it is that I'm trying to accomplish, and I often list that on the board: The objective for today is such and so. And when I finish the period, I often come back to the kids and say, "When mom and dad ask you what you learned in school today, here's what you're going to tell them." Because I know that too many times I've gone to classes where you sat in there and something was going on, but you never really knew what it was you were trying to get or supposed to get. And [the workshop instructors] instilled that idea in us--in me, at least--of careful planning: What is it that you're trying to do? What are the intermediary steps to get that learning accomplished? And how do you cut down on all the distractions that might just eat away on the time?
>
> Generally, a lot more of my energizing goes into presenting material than into maintaining control . . . I think I've worked [the control] out, and that's been a great savings for me because as I get older, I need to conserve. I seem to be less hassled in the classroom at these tasks, and I'm always reviewing in my mind, What's really important? It's reordered my whole priorities about teaching . . . Before, I taught kind of on automatic pilot--I just kind of did it. Now when I end the semester, I review it and say, "What went well, what didn't go well, and what kind of strategies do I need to think about for the next year?"

The workshop had not only changed the teachers' behavior in the classroom; it had positively affected their relationships with other GHHS teachers, primarily those who had been in the same session. The second class appeared to have been especially close, according to the teachers' reports. Alperin, for example, said, "The camaraderie and the friendship and the morale-lifting that developed in the group were absolutely immeasurable." She went on,

> We found we're all together. We all want the same things for the students. We all are attempting to do the same things, more or less, in our respective fields. All of us, no matter what our ages are, respect students. And we all found that it

> was absolutely one of the most uplifting things that we'd had happen to us in a school setting in a long time.

Liles said of the third class, which was in progress at the time of our visit,

> I think we're much more honest with one another. There's a kind of defense that you build up when you're talking to your peers outside. Everyone wants to seem really good and never admits what they do wrong. But in the group you have a chance to say what you did right and what you did wrong.

Liles' observations were reinforced by those of Harry Berejikian, who took over as SIP coordinator in mid-March when Kaufman went on sick leave for the rest of the semester. Berejikian found it difficult to assume the level of leadership Kaufman had assumed because it was Berejikian's first experience with the workshop whereas Kaufman had been in his third semester as leader before his illness. Nevertheless, Berejikian saw in the third class "a kind of enthusiasm" that he "just would not have expected to exist for any kind of a staff development program." He attributed the enthusiasm partly to Medinnis's and Roberts's competence, partly to the structure of the workshop, but mostly to the fact that the workshop was "opening up avenues of communication among people who just normally did not commun'cate with each other very much at all, if at all.

"These are professional avenues of communication," he stressed. "They have to do with the classroom."

The teachers were unstinting in their praise of Medinnis and Roberts as instructors. "Outstandingly competent," said Feuerstein. "The most knowledgeable that I've had anywhere along the line," Holodnik remarked. "I can't say enough nice things about those women and what we got out of it," Alperin volunteered.

Why were the instructors so admired? It seemed to be because of their collegial approach and their emphasis on proven strategies. Consider these remarks:

> Alperin: I think the fact that [Bernice] spoke about her successes and failures allowed every one of us to open up and speak about our own successes and failures and share with each other and feel better about it. So that when something occurs in the classroom and it's not a total success, we don't have to go home feeling that it's the end of the world.

> Holodnik: I was particularly impressed with how practical the strategies were, how convincing they were, how well thought out they were . . . [The instructors] were very sincere. If you're going to stay in teaching, you need to have every gimmick and ploy and technique that you can to be of help.

> And I think that their big selling point was that they did in fact furnish these. It wasn't at all phony.
>
> Liles: No matter what somebody says, there's always something positive [Bernice] can pull out of the answer. It may not tie in exactly or be the precise answer to the question, but she makes them feel as though they haven't goofed. You feel very free in saying what you [think].

Roberts thought the workshop was well received "mostly because we believe it's going to work."

> We haven't tried to do everything for everyone. We've tried to do some quality programs. And everything that we've done, we've tried to research. We haven't told them that things would work when we didn't have any proof that they would; we've gone in backed up by research. And we've been honest with them. We've shared our failures as well as our successes. We've told them we're there basically to assist them. We're not trying to show them the truth or the right way . . . We're just trying to show them some programs that have worked for other teachers.

Amidst all the praise a few words of criticism were heard. Feuerstein felt that there had been far too much focus on elementary school techniques; she would have designed the workshop to accommodate the greater subject orientation of high school teachers. Liles voiced one reservation:

> We're not making enough contribution personally to the whole thing. Earlier Marty had said that he would like very much to build a library of materials, and each group that came through could contribute. That's why I did the videotape, . . . to put in the library, to show another type of activity in a language class.
>
> So I would like to see us making a card file perhaps--each teacher with something that worked well in her subject and then have it there for the next group to use.

Both Chamberlain and Nero regretted that Medinnis and Roberts had not come more often than once a week. The group had bogged down sometimes, Nero commented.

A major factor in the instructors' not being more available was time, of course, and money. That brings up not a criticism of the workshop, but an obstacle to its replication. "It is very expensive," said Kaufman. The cost charged to the SIP grant was approximately $35,000 a year, an investment of almost $1,900 for each teacher who participated. That did not include Medinnis's and Roberts's time, which was paid for by

the teacher center. Because of the expense and the cutback in SIP funding for 1982-83, the next year's workshop was to be run only one semester. To compensate partly for that cutback, it would enroll 10 volunteer teachers instead of eight.

Kaufman and Medinnis had not as yet been able to arrange for an objective evaluation of the workshop but were talking about one. In the meantime, said Kaufman, they were getting subjective evaluations.

> We're finding that the people are saying, "I didn't know, Thank you, I wasn't aware." That kind of thing seems to suggest that everybody is gaining something. There may be other things going on in staff development that are not as productive as we'd like, but it seems to me that in terms of the funds we get from Sacramento to provide a better instructional program at our high school, this is one of the very best ways to spend our money. This program has immediate impact on improving what goes on between teacher and student.

The workshop at Granada Hills High School is one of many programs offered by the San Fernando Valley Teacher Center. Started in 1978 with a federal grant to California State University, Northridge, the center serves approximately 7,000 teachers and administrators from about 200 schools in two administrative regions that constitute about one-third of the Los Angeles Unified School District.

Situated north of Los Angeles proper and formerly a bedroom community of the city, the San Fernando Valley is fast becoming a center for industry and human services. The area's population is a cross-section of socioeconomic and ethnic groups, including a high percentage of Hispanics.

This chapter is based on a site visit to Los Angeles on March 29-30, 1982. Persons who were interviewed and provided assistance in gathering data were Ronnie Alperin, English teacher, Granada Hills High School; Frank Beal, math teacher, Granada Hills High School; Harry Berejikian, acting school-improvement-program coordinator, Granada Hills High School; Jean Chamberlain, music teacher, Granada Hills High School; Liba Feuerstein, English teacher, Granada Hills High School; Paul Greenwalt, policy board chairperson, San Fernando Valley Teacher Center, and fourth grade teacher, Wilbur Avenue School; Luis Hernandez, project director, San Fernando Valley Teacher Center, and professor, California State University, Northridge; John Holodnik, English teacher, Granada Hills High School; Martin Kaufman, school-improvement-program coordinator (on leave), Granada Hills High School; Dorothy Liles, foreign language teacher, Granada Hills High School; Bernice Medinnis, director, San Fernando Valley Teacher Center; Robert Miller, policy board member, San Fernando Valley Teacher Center, and English teacher, Millikan Junior High School; Norman Nero, foreign language teacher, Granada Hills High School; Janine Roberts, coordinator, San Fernando Valley Teacher Center; Aurora Stickels, social studies teacher, Granada Hills High School; and Kathy Yeates, consultant, California Department of Education, Office of Staff Development.

Conclusions, Observations, and Questions

In addition to examining exemplary practices at the teacher centers included in this study, I inquired about many characteristics that I thought might indicate how higher education teacher centers could be distinguished from other federally funded teacher centers. Subsequent to the site visits, I interviewed each director by phone to assure that my data on and impressions about these characteristics of teacher centers were accurate. The first part of this chapter presents a brief overview of each teacher center in terms of these facts and impressions. Table 1 summarizes the data. The second part of this chapter is a set of tentative conclusions about the five higher education teacher centers I studied. Next, I make some general observations based on my investigation, and finally I raise a question about the future of the teacher center and teacher centering in higher education.

Overviews of the Five Higher Education Teacher Centers

Chicago Teachers' Center, Northeastern Illinois University

The Chicago Teachers' Center (CTC) had a tenure-track professor as its director from the outset. Indeed, he was promoted while in that position. One or two half-time professors, referred to as faculty-in-residence, were on the CTC staff each year from its beginning. The staff also included two teachers on leave each year, one from the public schools and one from the parochial schools. The CTC had the same number of staff in 1983-1984 as it had under federal funding.

The CTC brought university personnel into the school. In 1983-84 they were brought in through an Arts in Education program that was an interdisciplinary effort in writing, graphic arts, dance, and music. The focus was integrating the arts into the basic skills. A half-time reading specialist worked with this program.

University faculty also gave courses offering what Chicago schools called "lane credit," which was the system for granting salary increases to teachers from the bachelor's level through the master's level to the master's-plus-30-semester-hours level. Both professors and teachers led one-shot workshops. School personnel, usually teachers, provided guidance to teachers afternoons and evenings on a drop-in basis and conducted a number of summer workshops. On a contract arrangement teachers designed curriculum units and wrote newspaper stories for the CTC. They collected recyclable materials for the make-and-take center and acted as general consultants.

Table 1: Summary of Data on Selected Teacher Center Characteristics.

	Chicago Teachers' Center	Hernando County Teacher Education Center	Madison County Teacher Center	Pittsburgh Area Center for Teachers	San Fernando Valley Teacher Center
Center survived (through November 1983).	Yes	Yes[1]	Yes	No	Yes[2]
Center was located on university campus.	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Center was located in school facility.	Yes[3]	Yes[4]	No	No	Yes
Director was from university.	Yes	No	Yes[5]	No	No[6]
Director was from school district.	No	Yes	Yes[5]	No	Yes
Staff was from university.	B	A	A	A	A
Staff was from school district.	C	D	D	D	D
Center brought faculty into schools.	B	C	B	A	A
University faculty led center activities.	C	C	B	A	A
Teachers led center activities.	C	B	C	C	C
Center staff led center activities.	C	C	B	C	C
Center was brokerage only.	No	No	Yes	No	No
Center was resource center.	Yes	Yes[7]	No	Yes[8]	Yes[9]
Center had make-and-take facilities.	Yes	Yes	No[10]	No	Yes

LEGEND: A = Little; rarely or never
B = Somewhat; sometimes
C = Strong; frequently
D = Great; usually

[1] It was taken over by the Hernando County Schools.
[2] It was taken over by the Los Angeles Unified School District.
[3] It was in a parochial school.
[4] It was in a special facility built by the school district to house the teacher center.
[5] The first director was a teacher; his successor was a university person.
[6] The project director was a university person, and the center director was from a school district.
[7] It had limited resources. It used an existing county school district resource center.
[8] It was used by staff to furnish materials to teachers.
[9] More accurately it was a curriculum development center.
[10] Satellite centers provided make-and-take facilities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Chicago Teachers' Center	Hernando County Teacher Education Center	Madison County Teacher Center	Pittsburgh Area Center for Teachers	San Fernando Valley Teacher Center
Center offered one-shot workshops.	C	C	C	B	C
. . . workshops of several sessions.	B	B	B	B	B
. . . semester-long activities.	A	B	A	A	A
. . . university courses.	B	B	A	A	A
Activities took place in center.	C	B	A	A	C
. . . in schools.	B	C	C	C	B
. . . at satellites.	A[11]	A[11]	C	A[11]	A[11]
Center offered advisory service.	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Center served elementary school teachers.	C	C	C	A	C
. . . middle and junior high school teachers.	B	C	B	C	B
. . . high school teachers.	B	C	B	D	B
. . . preservice teachers.	C	A	A	A	B
University credit was given for center activities.	B	B	A	A	A
Center engaged in school improvement.	C	C	C	B	C
Teacher organization influence was strong.	C	B	C	B	B
Center activities were documented.	C	B	B	B	B
Sources of financial support included federal government.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
. . . state government.	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
. . . local district(s).	Yes	Yes[12]	Yes[13]	No	Yes
. . . other.	Yes[14]	No	Yes[15]	No	No
Research was encouraged.	Yes	No	No	No	No
Research was conducted.	Yes	No	Yes[16]	Yes[17]	No
Activities were evaluated.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
University recognized value of center.	D	B	D	A	A

[11] These centers did not have satellites.
[12] The local district built the teacher center building and provided some staff time as in-kind services.
[13] It was minor.
[14] It came from grants and competitive funds.
[15] It came from the regional superintendent's office.
[16] There was at least one small research project related to teacher center work.
[17] There were at least three doctoral dissertations at the University of Pittsburgh.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Advisory service was also provided by the CTC, most notably through a project on active staffing (see Chapter 2 for a description) funded by the Teachers' Centers Exchange.

The CTC served elementary, middle, junior high, and senior high school teachers. The use by teachers in the lower schools was heavier. Increasingly efforts were being made to attract secondary school teachers; those efforts were meeting with the most success in the summer. The CTC also served preservice teachers, teacher aides, and parents, the latter particularly in connection with the Head Start program.

School improvement at the building level was referred to briefly above, in the Arts in Education program. This inservice education was directed at six teachers in each school, with a multiplier effect built in so that the original six teachers influenced the other teachers in their school.

The teacher union was involved in the governance of the CTC through the policy board, and it cooperated in developing the CTC's program. The Chicago-American Federation of Teachers newspaper served the CTC in advertising programs.

Documentation of CTC activities was accomplished through a variety of records--needs assessments, surveys, a file of all requests, a list of all people who had used or visited the CTC, evaluations of workshops, interviews and tape recordings, and pretests and posttests on programs like Arts in Education. More interest was developing in how teacher behavior and attitudes changed and whether there was a residue of change after a program was over.

Since federal funding ceased, the CTC was being supported through a regular line item in the university budget, which was state-appropriated money. There were also individual membership fees in the last two years, which brought in $4,000 to $5,000. Users of the CTC donated money for supplies. There were fees for workshops, and the CTC coordinated all contracts for the university's college of education courses, from which it extracted a percentage. The state grant for the Arts in Education program yielded $48,000 in 1983-84.

The CTC conducted and encouraged research. A recent project carried out with a grant from the Teachers' Centers Exchange resulted in the report, A Study of the Active Staffing Process of a Teachers' Center (Richek & Wilson, 1982).

A variety of people and organizations assisted the CTC staff in developing ideas and programs, particularly in its early stages. Pat Weiler and the American Federation of Teachers' teacher center project, funded by the National Institute of Education, were reported as being the most helpful. Theresa Lorio from the Detroit Center for Professional Growth and Development and Roz Herman from Long Island, New York,

also offered information, stimulation, and encouragement. The Teachers' Centers Exchange provided inspiration and was a source of research grants. The midwest cluster of federally funded teacher centers and the Washington meetings, both sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education (later the Education Department), were also cited as supporting and contributing factors in the development of the CTC.

Hernando County Teacher Education Center, University of South Florida

The Hernando County Teacher Education Center was probably the most unique arrangement of higher education sponsorship. The teacher education center was one of Florida's county teacher education centers funded by the Florida State Legislature's appropriation of $5 per student in every county. It was also directly funded by the U.S. Office of Education during the first three-year cycle of federal grants--the only teacher education center in the state so funded. During that three-year period the teacher education center worked closely with the University of South Florida, and there was considerable involvement of a number of professors. By the time the second round of funding was proposed, the school-university relationship was solid enough to make the shift to a university proposal uncomplicated. In fact, the shift in the proposed fiscal agent was made because the odds of qualifying as a higher education project seemed better than the odds of qualifying as a local-district project. When funding was approved, the operation of the teacher education center was subcontracted to the Hernando County Schools.

Throughout, the director was a person from the Hernando County Schools. During the time the University of South Florida was the fiscal agent, there was also a full-time tenured university professor on the staff, who was supplemented from time to time by as few as 2 and as many as 10 part-time professors. Professors conducted only a few workshops. Their work was mainly one-to-one with teachers or with small groups. They worked in schools with teachers, administrators, and other personnel. Examples of their work appear in Chapter 3.

The University of South Florida offered graduate courses for credit in Hernando County through the teacher education center. These were largely elective courses in the university's master's degree program and were designed to meet needs that teachers expressed. Professors also conducted most of the noncredit workshops.

To an extent, the teacher education center served as a resource center. It had some materials, but not an extensive collection. County-wide activities were typically held in the teacher education center, whereas projects focused on a particular school were held on site. Professors provided an advisory service to school personnel to achieve both individual professional growth and school improvement (illustrations are included in Chapter 3).

Teacher education center activities and services were capitalized on by teachers at all levels of schooling. There were more requests from elementary school teachers, but the clinical-professor program (see Chapter 3) operated successfully in the high schools. In the latter program professors worked with both administrators and teachers, much of the time on school-improvement projects.

Teacher organizations were involved in the development of the teacher education center, but did not play a strong role.

No documentation was done on the clinical-professor program because of the confidential nature of the professors' work with school personnel. A record was kept on workshop and graduate-program participation by teachers.

As already indicated, financial support was provided by both the federal and the state government. There was little local money except for the cost of constructing the teacher education center building and the cost of materials, printing, and professional time.

There was not much research conducted or encouraged by the teacher education center. The teacher education center did prepare materials for the regular review conducted by the state education agency and was part of the 1982 evaluation of Florida teacher education centers conducted by Evaluation Systems Design, Inc., for the (Florida) Education Standards Commission.

The teacher education center director responded, "Yes and no," when asked if the teacher education center had added something to the University of South Florida. On the one hand, the clinical-professor program was recognized in that the professors involved were given the highest raises in their college, but, the director said, the program did not get the recognition it deserved, and not enough was written about it.

Some help in the development of the teacher education center came from outside sources. In the early stages the Teachers' Centers Exchange provided support for three people to travel to the northeastern states to visit a number of established centers. The teacher center projects of both the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association provided help, the former through materials, the latter through workshops for developing centers. The southeast cluster activities for teacher centers supported by the U.S. Office of Education were seen as very helpful, and ideas came also from the Teachers' Centers Exchange, the Association of Teacher Educators, and the National Council of States on Inservice Education. The most help, however, came from the University of South Florida. Collaboration with the university people was excellent. University personnel gained the confidence and the respect of both teachers and administrators in Hernando County.

Madison County Teacher Center,
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville

The Madison County Teacher Center (MCTC) was located on Southern Illinois University's campus. It was a suite of offices, and it served as an administrative hub and brokerage. Three satellite centers were situated in school buildings across Madison County. They were the main activity centers of the MCTC although that was more the case during federal funding than it was after. They housed resources for teachers and facilities for make-and-take.

The first director of the MCTC was a teacher, who was selected from the ranks of Madison County school personnel. After federal funding, the university provided the director, the associate dean of education, who had been an active supporter of the MCTC and a member of its policy board. He had, in fact, written the original proposal for the MCTC. The initial staff of the MCTC included other teachers on leave from the Madison County schools who, with the director, organized and conducted inservice activities. University professors also led workshops, but as the MCTC got under way, more and more of the workshop leaders were teachers.

The MCTC offered a variety of activities--sessions that brought national figures to Madison County as speakers and consultants, resource rooms at satellite centers where teachers could develop materials, but mostly one-shot workshops on topics teachers identified in needs assessments, or on subjects the director and the staff thought that teachers wanted. Few of the MCTC's offerings carried graduate credit, but participation in workshops did earn inservice education credits in the teacher's school district.

As the chapter on the MCTC indicates, there were numerous thoughts about how MCTC could contribute to school improvement. However, at this writing, there was little action under way to carry out that thinking.

Teacher organizations, both the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers, supported the MCTC, primarily by the selection of teachers to serve on the policy board. MCTC was one of the teacher centers where school administrators had been leery of the influence that unions might have, but their anxiety proved not to have been justified.

There was little formal documentation of the development and the accomplishments of the MCTC except for evaluations after each activity. One graduate student paper evaluated the early development of the MCTC.

Financial support in the three years of federal funding was supplemented in minor ways by inservice education funds from the education service region. Part of the money collected by the state for recertification ($4 per teacher) and earmarked for inservice education, and some school district money out of teacher-institute budgets reached

the MCTC to support activities those agencies requested. In-kind support in services and training was contributed by the state education agency.

There was no research effort on the part of the MCTC, although at least one research project was indirectly connected with MCTC activity (see the reference to Professor Blackhurst's project in Chapter 4). The university, from the dean's office down, recognized the importance of the MCTC to the university. The university's assumption of major responsibility for MCTC after federal funding demonstrated the value decision makers placed on it.

The MCTC received little direct help from the Teachers' Centers Exchange or any other national project or group except for publications and other communiques distributed by such groups. However, teacher leaders and university personnel acknowledged substantial support from the Illinois State Board of Education.

Pittsburgh Area Center for Teachers, Carnegie-Mellon University

The Pittsburgh Area Center for Teachers (PACT) was established by a few Carnegie-Mellon professors with support from Pittsburgh teachers (affiliated with the American Federation of Teachers) and teachers in nearly 30 districts surrounding Pittsburgh (affiliated with the National Education Association). There had never been a strong commitment to teacher education at the university. The program had always been small and had enrolled only a few students. At the time PACT was established, the priorities of the university were being reexamined, and before the three-year period of the federal grant was over, it became clear that Carnegie-Mellon University (CMU) would drop teacher education entirely.

In the initial year the teacher center staff were not privy to the newly established program priorities of CMU. The first director got wind of the future during her second year and decided to leave.

Even before the future was clear, though, university professors only occasionally led PACT activities. The first director was selected from outside the ranks of professors. A recent Carnegie-Mellon PhD, she was put in a non-tenure-track position. Other PACT staff were teachers on leave (called Teacher Associates) from schools in the service area. They were paid their regular salary out of the PACT budget. Two CMU professors served on the policy board, but tenured professors only occasionally participated in PACT activities in schools.

Most workshops and other inservice activities were conducted in schools by PACT staff or outside people (often teachers) with special skills. Although PACT served as a resource center, the practice was for Teacher Associates to take requested materials to teachers in schools rather than having teachers come to PACT to locate and use materials.

Some activities did take place on campus in the center, but most were held in schools. There was some commitment to school improvement, in the form of assigning Teacher Associates (described in Chapter 5) to work regularly and intensively with teachers in one building. The school-improvement program in one school turned out to be very successful. A similar practice was tried in another school but was abandoned because the distance to the school was too great and the travel was too time-consuming.

The emphasis at PACT was on secondary school teachers--middle, junior high, and high school--because the professors involved had considerable background and experience in the social sciences at that level. PACT specialized in providing advisory service; that is, Teacher Associates worked with individual teachers as confidants, resource people, counselors, and support people.

In addition to advisory service and school-improvement efforts, PACT offered workshops for teachers on topics they indicated were important and needed. University graduate credit was not given for any PACT work.

The teacher organizations in the Pittsburgh area were active in supporting PACT at the outset. Members of the policy board came from both unions, but neither group supported PACT strongly after it became operational.

There was some documentation of the progress of PACT, but it was never used outside of PACT's immediate governance and administrative groups. Several doctoral studies on PACT (three that we could locate) were completed at the University of Pittsburgh. None were undertaken at CMU. In fact, one professor suggested that there was not a legitimate research study possible in the teacher center.

Money to operate PACT came entirely from federal funds. There were some in-kind contributions from CMU, such as space and faculty time.

The university, it was apparent, did not regard PACT as adding anything to the institution, and behaved accordingly.

San Fernando Valley Teacher Center,
California State University at Northridge

The San Fernando Valley Teacher Center was located at the Lanai Elementary School, which was part of the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). The director of the teacher center project was a university person. The director of the teacher center itself and its one other professional staff member were both LAUSD personnel.

The teacher center staff, teachers from the LAUSD schools, California State University-Northridge staff, personnel from the

University of Southern California and the University of California at Los Angeles, and others led activities for the teacher center. Arrangements to participate in teacher center activities were made privately with individual professors outside the organization of the university. The fees for such assistance were lower than most professors would accept, so many consultants came from the school system or other agencies.

The teacher center served as a curriculum development center. Teachers created materials. They could xerox teacher center materials, and there were facilities for make-and-take. The teacher center tended not to duplicate what was available in the school district's regional centers.

Activities took place in the teacher center, in schools, and at two satellite centers. A major program of the teacher center was its Saturday Curriculum Conferences. These were all-day activities that included a keynote address followed by four one-and-a-half-hour sessions during each of which teachers could choose among a variety of topics. The sessions were developed to address needs and interests teachers had expressed. Approximately 300 teachers took part in these Saturday conferences each week. Teachers could attend more than one. Attendance at two (16 hours) earned LAUSD inservice education credit. No graduate credit was offered for these activities.

The teacher center also provided advisory service to schools and individuals, more to the former. The advisory service to schools entailed getting teams including administrators started on school improvement. The teams were expected to continue training within their school, largely on their own. There were also all-day training sessions for administrators to prepare them for school-improvement projects.

As with so many teacher centers, elementary school teachers were served in about a 4-to-1 ratio to secondary school teachers. Work was just beginning in 1983-84 on Saturday Curriculum Conferences for secondary school teachers. Selected personnel whom the teacher center had trained were designated as master teachers. They included 128 elementary school teachers (16 in each of the LAUSD's eight regions) and 48 junior high school teachers (6 in each region).

The teacher center had close ties to and a good relationship with the teacher union. However, teacher policy board members were chosen through a matrix system (see the diagram below) in which candidates at each grade level and in various specialties were suggested by teachers.

	Reading	Science	Math	Language	Social Studies	Etc.
K						
↕						
12						

Documentation took several forms. Records were kept of people attending teacher center activities. An evaluation of every activity asked participants what ideas they had obtained from an activity, how they were helped as a teacher, and what effect their participation had on students. An inadvertent bit of evaluation took place when the school district polled administrators on how federal block-grant (ECIA) money should be spent. The teacher center was the first choice.

The center did not conduct or encourage research. There was interest, but as yet none had been done.

Whether the teacher center added something to the university is problematic. With professors the teacher center's contribution was a very individualistic matter. Some thought that the teacher center was the best thing going, and they were sending their undergraduate students to teacher center sessions, particularly classroom-management training. However, many thought that the teacher center had had very little impact on the university. In the opinion of the director, the vision initially held for the teacher center did not materialize. The conviction was that professors would be better off if they had more contact with teachers, and vice versa. That was not the case. Teachers wanted more practical help than professors wanted to give, and the teacher center was not an attractive contractual source; that is, it could not pay professors what they could get elsewhere for consultant work. A further difficulty was that the university felt that the teacher center might take over the inservice education market.

The conflict between shorter, practical training sessions offered by the teacher center and longer, in-depth study advocated by university professors was not resolved at this writing.

Assistance in developing the teacher center came primarily from state education agency personnel (Kathy Yeates's work was mentioned particularly). They convened all the California teacher centers, federally and state funded, and provided a stimulus to share and examine possibilities. They organized a session at which inservice education entrepreneurs could demonstrate wares. And they provided a clearinghouse and nerve center at the state level. At the national level the U.S. Office of Education tried to get higher education teacher centers together at Washington meetings to promote sharing and interchange. But, in the director's opinion, higher education teacher centers did not have enough in common. The Teachers' Centers Exchange and the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study sponsored by the California Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensure provided research and information of value to the development of the teacher center program. The Institute for Research in Teaching at Michigan State University was also cited as being very helpful in providing material on effective teaching, which was used in the teacher center's program.

Since the termination of federal funding the center was being

supported by the LAUSD and had only a loose connection with California State University at Northridge, primarily in a joint project on computers.

Tentative Conclusions

In Chapter 1 I reported on the major questions asked and the serious doubts expressed about higher education teacher centers back in 1976 when the teacher center legislation was passed. I will attempt to answer those questions and speak to those doubts now. Some of the answers probably became apparent to the reader in Chapters 2-6, but others were not addressed directly in those pages because they were not germane to the exemplary practice being described.

The tentative conclusions that I draw below pertain to the five higher education teacher centers that I studied. My perspective is much broader than what I learned at those five sites, however. Between December 1981 and November 1982 I visited 12 other federally funded teacher centers, including one other higher education teacher center. Papers similar to Chapters 2-6 have been written on 10 of them so far. In addition, I have visited over 50 teacher centers altogether, directed a three-year project for over 40 developing teacher centers in 27 states, and studied and written about critical issues and other teacher center and inservice education topics.

I will address the questions raised in Chapter 1 largely in the order in which they appeared.

1. The intellectual, psychological, and social tone of the five higher education teacher centers I studied was not distinguishable from that of school district teacher centers. This is not to say that any of the five teacher centers were lacking in such tone. It is merely to say that without prior knowledge, it would have been difficult, if not impossible, to know whether the fiscal agent was a school district or a college or university. I encountered higher education people, or people with comparable credentials and experience, in all 17 centers.

2. The five higher education teacher centers were not dominated by college and university professors. Most used professors in their programs and governance, but that was true in all of the 17 teacher centers I visited. In one of the five higher education teacher centers, professors were hired on a consultant basis. Many professors expected remuneration greater than the teacher center's rate, essentially negating their participation. In most of the other higher education teacher centers, professors participated as a part of their regular university assignment. That arrangement proved superior to the overload, private-entrepreneur system.

3. I did not attempt to observe inservice education programs conducted by colleges or universities in the six higher education teacher centers, but I did ask questions about whether the offerings of the

colleges and universities, other than those in the teacher center, had been influenced by the teacher center. A summary of the answers is, There was some impact, but not much. In my opinion, most professors who conducted university courses or workshops in a teacher center manner would have done so with or without the presence of a teacher center.

4. Greater attention to a better mesh between theory and practice was evident in three of the five higher education teacher centers (CTC, the Hernando County Teacher Education Center, and the San Fernando Valley Teacher Center). In those three centers application and interpretation of research were obvious. In the first two, relating theory to practice was directly attributable to the involvement of university professors. At the San Fernando Valley Teacher Center I was not convinced that the university was the instigator of the use of research findings.

5. In Chapter 1 I reported questions about the motives of colleges and universities for applying for teacher center funding. I found no evidence at the five sites to support the claim that higher education teacher centers engaged underemployed professors, and at only one institution was there the suggestion (from several people) that institutional rewards for securing a grant were an important motive in competing for funding.

6. There was also no evidence that teachers' needs were being minimized or ignored because the teacher center was in a college or university. In all cases there were policy boards and other mechanisms for ascertaining teachers' needs, and there was every indication that the teacher center program was attempting to provide what teachers wanted within the limits of the budget. But not infrequently, the teacher center seemed too separate, even isolated, from college and university affairs. In some instances there were professors who had little or no knowledge of what was going on at the teacher center. In three of the five teacher centers, the staff had more communication and contact with teachers in schools than with college or university professors.

7. The traditional inservice education practices of colleges and universities, which have so often been maligned for imposing on teachers what professors determine to be valid fare, proved not to be the practices followed at higher education teacher centers. The inservice education practices at higher education teacher centers were little or no different from those followed at school district teacher centers. Practices across higher education teacher centers were as different as they were across teacher centers in general.

8. The reported skepticism about the possibility of institutionalizing a teacher center at a college or university proved valid in regard to some institutions, unwarranted in regard to others. Actually, only two of the five higher education teacher centers (CTC and MCTC) were institutionalized, and only one of those became an integral part of the sponsoring university (CTC). At PACT and the San Fernando Valley Teacher Center institutionalization was not achieved because the

university did not want or was not able to incorporate the teacher center. After federal funding the Hernando County Teacher Education Center was institutionalized into the local district. Its funding reverted mainly to that supplied by the state. The fact that institutionalization of some sort occurred at two universities negates the notion that institutionalization of a higher education teacher center is impossible.

9. The charge that higher education people had little or no experience in teacher-centered inservice education proved not to have been valid. In my judgment, higher education people participating in teacher center activities had as much know-how and ability to conduct such activities as did public school or other nonuniversity people. There was considerable cross-fertilization between higher education and public school people. In many cases they learned from each other. Collaboration was often stimulating and productive. Granted, professors who participated did so voluntarily. Often professors who were known to operate in a teacher center mode were sought out by teacher center staff, and people who did not rate well on evaluations were usually not invited to repeat.

Observations

What follows are some more general observations I made in the course of my visits to the five higher education teacher centers. These too are made against the backdrop of my wide experience with teacher centers. I take full responsibility for the observations. However, I shared this chapter with the directors of the five higher education teacher centers and received no major challenge to the observations.

1. Most of the five higher education teacher centers conducted short workshops, often one-time sessions on a topic or problem, to serve teachers. One-shot activities usually addressed immediate, pressing problems and dealt with those problems in pragmatic ways that provided materials, techniques, or solutions for teachers to use on their return to school. After such survival-type issues were dealt with, the teacher centers began to address broader questions of curriculum and teaching that required more time and several sessions to investigate.

2. There was some attention to school improvement, school climate and teacher morale, curriculum development, and improvements in strategies of teaching. Addressing such issues often raised questions about how much teacher centers should deal with teachers' problems and needs, as opposed to school problems, and whether problems were being identified by teachers or the system of which they were a part. Such choices were related to the issue of whether and to what extent teacher participation in teacher center activities should be voluntary.

3. Control by teachers of the teacher center, by virtue of their majority on policy boards, was seldom a bone of contention, contrary to

what had been anticipated by higher education administrators. Policy boards seemed to find agreement on program and direction, and, after some initial sparring, school district and higher education members usually found common purposes. There was no parting of the ways. Policy board members withdrawing in protest was practically unheard of.

4. Voluntary participation by teachers in teacher center activities was maintained as a basic premise in all higher education teacher centers. Participation by choice developed favorable attitudes toward the teacher centers, and once it was established as a norm, teachers who had at first been reluctant to participate, appeared at teacher centers in increasing numbers. The confidentiality of work with teachers, as it was demonstrated in practice, increased teachers' trust and encouraged more teachers to participate. Neither voluntary participation nor confidentiality maintained by staff working with teachers, however, was unique to higher education teacher centers.

5. After initial efforts to ascertain teachers' needs, formal needs assessments of all teachers in a service area were not prominent. Discovering what teachers wanted became more targeted and informal, and staff took greater initiative in determining program on the basis of their perceptions of teachers' needs.

6. Policy boards seemed to become less dominant in establishing program. More discretion was left to the director and the staff while policy boards concentrated on policy and survival strategies.

7. Most of the five higher education teacher centers conducted little research, although all expressed an interest in it. Researchers at universities were apparently not attracted or enticed to do research, and there were few funds available to undertake systematic investigations. There was also not the volume of writing and publication on teacher center programs by higher education people that one might have expected when one considers the traditions and the rewards of colleges and universities for such activities.

8. The five teacher centers served mainly elementary school teachers, except for PACT, which was created to serve secondary school teachers. People associated with the four other teacher centers recognized the need to attract more secondary school teachers and were cogitating how that might be accomplished.

9. Most of the five teacher centers did little to initiate programs for graduate credit. Such programs were thought by many teacher center people to be in conflict with the teacher center premise of voluntarism. When courses for credit were offered, they were usually for study that teachers requested. School district inservice credit, most often provided automatically when a teacher reported participating in a teacher center activity, was prevalent.

10. Advisory service was not a primary activity at most of the five teacher centers, although it was recognized as desirable by all of them. Three of the five centers, however, did a considerable amount of advisory work. Advisory work is expensive, is time-consuming, and requires highly skilled personnel. Most budgets did not have the staff or the time needed for it.

11. Not much use of the five teacher centers was made by teachers-in-training, although teacher education programs were prominent in four of the five universities. No reason I could identify accounted for that. My hunch is that the teacher centers were perceived as inservice education operations and the possibilities for a preservice-inservice continuum were not explored.

12. All five higher education teacher centers related primarily to colleges and departments of education. A few used professors in the sciences and arts.

13. Open education got no more, and probably less, emphasis than any other persuasion about schools. The pressure for accountability, interpreted as an emphasis on "basics," may be one reason for the dwindling connection between open education and teacher centers.

14. Documentation in the five higher education teacher centers was largely quantitative, what could be counted--such things as the number of teachers who had used the teacher center, the number of teachers who rated various teacher center offerings highly, etc.

15. The survival of the teacher centers depended largely on the willingness of the institution, local school district, regional education office, and state education agency to fund continuation, not on grants from foundations or competitive federal or state programs.

16. The degree to which the universities embraced their teacher center varied greatly. At Northeastern Illinois University the CTC became a department. Southern Illinois University took over the MCTC. The Hernando County Teacher Education Center and the San Fernando Valley Teacher Center became school district operations, and at Carnegie-Mellon University, PACT was dissolved. The fate of each teacher center was consistent with the value the university placed on having a teacher center.

17. Teacher unions played less of a role in the development and the survival of these five teacher centers than might have been expected, considering the strong backing teacher unions gave the teacher center legislation in its initial stages.

18. Help in development at the five teacher centers came mainly from the Teachers' Centers Exchange, the American Federation of Teachers and National Education Association teacher center projects (both funded by

the National Institute of Education), and the former U.S. Office of Education, now the Education Department.

19. Opinions differed radically on the future of teacher centers in higher education. As might be expected, opinions varied according to the success each teacher center had in continuing to get higher education support. The conclusion I draw is that where a college or university believed in it, the teacher center idea had a definite future. Why an institution of higher education believes in sponsoring a teacher center is both a philosophical and practical question. Justifying such a commitment has many facets. Some are as basic as the concept that an institution holds for higher education at the postbaccalaureate level. Others are more pragmatic, dealing with the role an institution sees for itself in serving the teaching profession.

The question I have in concluding the study, reflecting on the experience, and writing this monograph, is: Should colleges and universities, more specifically, schools and colleges of education, establish teacher centers, or something comparable but more comprehensive (say, institutes for professional development)? These new enterprises would not replace or supersede programs and practices currently under way. They would be created to --

1. Capitalize on the teacher center experience to improve the inservice education of school personnel.

2. Reinforce the notion, in practice, that professional development is a continuum beginning in the preservice program of teacher education and continuing throughout a professional career.

3. Provide a continuing link with the reality of public schools.

4. Expand the concept of teacher centers and chart some new directions in professional development and school improvement.

5. Reduce the social and intellectual distance between educators in colleges and universities and educators in the public schools.

6. Provide a conduit through which public schools would have easier access to the science and arts resources of colleges and universities.

References

Richek, M. A., & Wilson, I. H. (1982). A study of the active staffing process of a teachers' center. Chicago: Northeastern Illinois University, Chicago Teachers' Center.